Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-226
Monday
27 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-226 *27 November 1989*

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gerasimov Press Briefing 24 Nov 1
Space Laser Tests Denied 1
Planned U.S. Troop Cuts 1
'Alarmed' by El Salvador 1
Nicaraguan Talks Suspension 1
Iranian Official's Visit 1
Central American Peace Process 2
Shevardnadze on Settling Regional Conflicts *[TASS]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Previews Possible Malta Talks Topics *[Vasilyev, 25 Nov]* 3
Shevardnadze on Gorbachev's Malta Agenda *[Moscow TV]* 4
Bush Cited on Preparations for Upcoming Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 5
Ship To Host Gorbachev-Bush Talks Described *[TASS]* 5
Cruiser 'Slava' Sets Off *[TASS]* 5
Baltic Council Issues Appeal to Gorbachev, Bush *[Vilnius International]* 6
Baker Letter to 'Latvian Charge d'Affaires' *[Aleksandrov in IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 6
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 1990 Pentagon Budget *[21 Nov]* 7
Zorin Views U.S. Attitude To Military Cuts *[Moscow International]* 7
Mosbacher, Katushev Conclude Session on Trade *[TASS]* 7
News Conference *[Moscow TV]* 8
TASS on Pentagon's 'Secret' Shuttle Mission 8
U.S. Senate Agrees on Aid for Poland, Hungary *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Nov]* 8
Roundtable Views Parliamentarians' U.S. Visit *[Moscow TV]* 9

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze Statement on South Kurile Islands *[TASS]* 12
Troop Withdrawal Preparations Begin in Mongolia *[TASS]* 12

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Lebanon *[TASS]* 13
Shevardnadze, Iran's Mottaki Hold 'Frank' Talks 13
Resolution 598 Given 'High Priority' *[Tehran IRNA]* 13
Supreme Soviet Delegation Leaves for Syria *[TASS]* 14
Tarasov Holds Discussion With 'Arafat in Tunis *[TASS]* 14
Afghanistan To Release 2 Soviet Prisoners of War *[Moscow Radio]* 14
State of Emergency in Afghanistan Extended *[TASS]* 15
U.S. Afghan Stance Seen as Counterproductive *[Glukhov in PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 15

East Europe

Polish Premier Mazowiecki Continues Visit, Talks 16
Meets With Ryzhkov, Accords Signed *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 16
PAP Interviews Gorbachev Before Talks *[Warsaw PAP]* 17
Mazowiecki-Gorbachev Meeting 24 Nov *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 17
Says Gorbachev 'Extremely Positive' *[Warsaw PAP]* 19
Ryzhkov Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 19
Mazowiecki Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 21

24 Nov Activities Summarized *[Warsaw PAP]* 23
Meets With Soviet Poles *[Warsaw PAP]* 25
Holds News Conference 25 Nov *[Warsaw Radio]* 25
'Common Language' Found in Talks *[TASS]* 29
Talks 'Businesslike, Frank' *[TASS]* 29
Confirms Polish Role in Warsaw Pact *[Moscow TV]* 30
Lays Wreath at Katyn Memorial *[TASS]* 31
Visits Zagorsk Monastery *[Warsaw PAP]* 31
Seen Off for Leningrad by Ryzhkov *[Moscow Radio]* 31
Ties With Poland, Mazowiecki Visit Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 31
Mazowiecki Thanks Soviet Leaders for Message *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 33
Gorbachev Message to Polish-Soviet Amity Society *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 33
Jaruzelski Cited on European Security *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 33
Jaruzelski, Mazowiecki Meet With EEC Officials *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 34
Rakowski Answers Sejm Critics of Previous Regime *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 34
Ethnic Poles Form Cultural Association *[Warsaw Radio]* 34
Reportage on CSSR Unrest, Leadership Changes 35
Miners Express Support for Jakes *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 35
Strike May Depend on CPCZ Plenum Outcome *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 35
CPCZ Seen 'Lagging Behind' Events *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 36
25 Nov CPCZ Plenum Decisions Reported *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 36
Havel, Dubcek Address Prague Crowds *[Moscow Radio]* 38
CSSR Opposition Seen Lacking Clear-Cut Plans *[TASS]* 38
Prague Demonstrations 'Not Letting Up' *[Moscow Radio]* 39
Adamec Addresses 26 Nov Rally *[TASS]* 39
Movement Toward Dialogue Noted *[Moscow TV]* 39
Mass Meetings Continue in Bratislava *[TASS]* 40
New CPCZ Chief Urges Negotiation *[Moscow Radio]* 40
Failure To Reform Seen Fostering CSSR Unrest *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 41
Medvedev, Others Meet CPCZ's Fojtik 17 Nov *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 42
CPSU Group Views Local Self-Management in CSSR *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 42
GDR Border Clampdown, Honecker Indictment Noted *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 42
Leadership's Economic Dilemma Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 43
Negative Effects of GDR Border Opening Foreseen *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 43
'Shortfalls' Noted in GDR-USSR Trade Protocol *[East Berlin ADN]* 43
CPSU's Falin, SPD's Diengels Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 44
GDR Paper Notes Reunification 'Not on Agenda'
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Nov] 44
GDR Political, Economic Reform Program Outlined
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov] 44
GDR New Forum Leader on Movement's Aims, Views *[MOSCOW NEWS No 47]* 45
Demonstration by GDR Youth League Members Noted
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Nov] 46
Gorbachev Message Congratulates Ceausescu *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 47
1990 Trade Agreement With Romania Signed *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 47
BCP Working Toward 'Open, Honest Dialogue' *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 47
BCP Politburo Meeting Discusses Renewal Process
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Nov] 47
Bulgaria's Todorov, Mladenov View Developments *[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]* 48
BCP's Mladenov Stresses Need for Reforms *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Nov]* 48
Supreme Soviet Greetings to Bulgaria's Mladenov *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 49
Hungarian Poll Seen as Opposition Maneuvering *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 49
Protest Movements in East Europe Viewed *[Gramatchikov on Moscow International]* 49
Military Observer on East European Processes *[Markushin in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Nov]* 50

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet on Language, Nationality Bills *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 52
Primakov Chairs 22 Nov Supreme Soviet Commission *[Moscow TV]* 52

Salykov Urges 'Practical Action' on Environment *[Moscow TV]* 53
Vyucheyskiy Describes 2d Nuclear Test Site *[Moscow TV]* 54
Moscow TV Relays 24 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings 55
1600 GMT 55
1639 GMT 56
1732 GMT 57
1747 GMT 58
1845 GMT 59
1949 GMT 61
2021 GMT 63
2135 GMT 64
2244 GMT 65
Gorbachev Chairs Baltic Autonomy Debate 24 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 67
Further on Autonomy Debate *[TASS]* 67
Supreme Soviet Session Resumes 27 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Morning Session Summarized *[TASS]* 68
Press Bill Considered *[TASS]* 68
Baltic Autonomy Law Adopted *[TASS]* 69

Political & Social

Gorbachev Article on Socialism Published *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 70
Sakharov Calls For End to One-Party System *[AFP]* 80
Prokofyev Interviewed on New Position *[Moscow TV]* 81
Zaykov Interviewed on Defense Council Job *[PRAVDA 27 Nov]* 82
Yakovlev Links Perestroyka, Freedom of Choice *[TASS]* 84
Editor Starkov Explains Refusal To Resign *[Moscow TV]* 85
Shevardnadze on Role of Science in Foreign Policy *[Moscow TV]* 86
10 Wounded in Ethnic Violence in Georgia *[AFP]* 86
Leningrad Rally Demands Emergency CPSU Congress *[Moscow TV]* 87
'Alarm' Voiced Over 22 Nov Leningrad Rally *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 87
Ukrainian Catholics Stage Demonstration 26 Nov *[AFP]* 89
Official Says No Government Repression of Miners *[TASS]* 89
Komi Aide Denies Vorkuta Miners Being Prosecuted *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 90
Kemerovo Obkom Holds Plenum 24 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 90
Interregional Deputies Discuss Upcoming Congress *[TASS]* 91
RSFSR Sets Up Committee for National Questions *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Nov]* 91
Interregional Development Front Set Up *[Moscow TV]* 91
Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet To Meet 26 Dec *[Baku Radio]* 91
Armenian Parliament Session Postponed to 4 Dec *[Yerevan Radio]* 91
NKAO Council Welcomes U.S. Senate Resolution *[Yerevan International]* 91
Armenian Group Condemns USSR Reaction *[Yerevan International]* 92
U.S. Resolution Defended *[Yerevan Radio]* 92
Gorbachev Response on NKAO Question Criticized *[Yerevan International]* 93
Armenians Warn Gorbachev of Regional Tension *[Yerevan Radio]* 93
Uzbek Delegate Explains Student Forum Walkout *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 93
New Uzbek Deputy Premier Appointed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 7 Nov]* 94
Uzbek Party Plenum Announces Personnel Changes *[Tashkent Radio]* 94
Uzbek Supreme Soviet Concludes Session *[Tashkent Radio]* 94
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Adopts Laws *[Moscow TV]* 94
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Addresses Ethnic Issues *[Moscow TV]* 95
Minorities Law Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 95
Lithuanians Seek Referendum on Soldiers' Vote *[Vilnius Radio]* 95
Estonia Streamlines Government Structure *[IZVESTIYA 21 Nov]* 96
Estonian Komsomol Congress Opens 24 Nov *[TASS]* 96
Comparison of Slyunkov Economic Conference Speech *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 96

Economic

Conversion of Defense Sector Discussed *[TASS]* 97
Shortage of Newsprint Causes Alarm 98
Deputy Minister Interviewed *[TRUD 28 Oct]* 98
Periodicals Threatened *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Oct]* 98

Full Employment Advocate Discusses Problems *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 100
Nonferrous Metallurgy Short of Consumer Targets *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 102

Scientific

TASS Reports 'Mir' Module Launch 26 Nov 103
Details Given 103
Final Preparations 103
Launch Announced 104
Further Details 104
'Kvant-2' Battery Panel Fails To Open *[TASS]* 104
'Kvant-2' Profile, Orbital Parameters *[TASS]* 105
'Kvant-2' Module Measurements *[Moscow Radio]* 105
'Cosmos 2050' Satellite Launched 23 Nov *[TASS]* 105

Military

Tu-22M Aircraft Crashes in Tatarskiy Strait *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 105
Lizichev Talks With Delegates to Student Forum *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Nov]* 105
Political Chief Interviewed on Strategic Forces' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Nov]* 106

TASS Reports Gerasimov Press Briefing 24 Nov

Space Laser Tests Denied

LD2411163289 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—"The Soviet Union has never conducted nor is conducting any laser-weapon tests in outer space," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

"The more so, for it has no technical means to place such weapons in orbit," he added.

Gerasimov was commenting on THE WASHINGTON TIMES report that the USSR allegedly placed an anti-satellite laser weapons system in orbit in 1983.

The spokesman observed that American congressmen had an opportunity to verify his words for themselves during a visit to the Soviet laser complex in Sary-Shagan last summer.

Noting that THE WASHINGTON TIMES article could be described as another propaganda hoax, Gerasimov emphasised that it contradicts the spirit of the times and the positive processes that currently characterise the Soviet-American dialogue in the sphere of nuclear arms reduction.

Planned U.S. Troop Cuts

LD2411165189 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The Soviet Union has noted THE NEW YORK TIMES' report that the United States is considering more drastic reductions of its troops in Europe that previously planned, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He pointed out that this step in the correct direction would be duly assessed.

Gerasimov recalled that the Soviet Union is already carrying out large-scale unilateral cuts of its Armed Forces.

As of November 1, 1989, three armoured divisions and one air force regiment had been withdrawn from the territory of Warsaw Treaty member countries.

A total of more than 50,000 men, 3118 tanks, 768 field-guns and 351 planes have been pulled out of Europe and Mongolia. The overall numerical strength of the Soviet Armed Forces was reduced by 235,500 men.

"Unilateral steps to reduce the Armed Forces undoubtedly correspond to the spirit of the times and will contribute to reaching the earliest possible accord in Vienna at the talks on conventional armed forces," Gerasimov said.

"This accord would make an invaluable contribution to safeguarding European security in conditions of peace and stability and to the creation of more favourable conditions for building an all-European home."

'Alarmed' by El Salvador

LD2411173289 Moscow TASS in English 1651 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The Soviet Union is alarmed over the continued armed confrontation in El Salvador, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He said that the USSR positively assessed the adoption of resolutions on the situation in El Salvador by the General Assembly of the Organisation of American States and the emergency session of that body.

The USSR is continuing its efforts to help find a peaceful political settlement of the conflict, Gerasimov said.

The Soviet Union has carried out corresponding measures lately through U.N. channels and is maintaining contacts with the governments of several countries.

Nicaraguan Talks Suspension

LD2411174689 Moscow TASS in English 1734 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—At a briefing today, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov expressed regret over the suspension of the Washington negotiations between Nicaraguan Government and armed opposition representatives.

"Direct contacts between the Nicaraguan Government and armed opposition are important. A cease-fire and the disbandment of the Contras are essential not only for the development of the political situation in Nicaragua but for a Central American settlement as a whole," he said.

Useful work in that area "could be done by representatives of the United Nations and the Organisation of American States secretaries-general. They have already stated their readiness to continue maintaining necessary contacts with the Nicaraguan Government and the Contras in order to resume negotiations," he said.

"This goal should also be promoted by all other parties with influence in the region that are interested in a peace settlement of the conflict," the spokesman said.

Iranian Official's Visit

LD2511121289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 24 Nov (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, declared at a briefing today that in the Soviet Union attention has been drawn to THE NEW YORK TIMES report that a greater than planned reduction in U.S. troops in Europe is being considered. [passage omitted]

Gennadiy Gerasimov reported that Manuchehr Mottaki, Iranian deputy minister for international affairs, who arrived in Moscow on Thursday, will discuss with the USSR leadership results of the trip to Iran and Iraq by Jan Eliasson, special representative of the UN secretary general, and issues connected with implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 598.

The Foreign Ministry representative further reported that a group of Soviet academic economists and experts headed by Academician Abel Aganbegyan was in Baghdad from 9 to 19 November to jointly study with Iraqi organizations proposals for a joint long-term program of trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Iraq until 2005.

Gennadiy Gerasimov expressed gratitude to the people of Cyprus and the Armenian community of this small country for the significant material help they had given to Soviet Armenia in connection with the natural disaster which struck the latter. He also thanked them for issuing a stamp in memory of the victims of the December earthquake.

Central American Peace Process

LD2411222789 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The Soviet Union is seriously concerned over the future of the peace process in Central America and seeks to help bring about the earliest possible resumption of talks and the implementaion of earlier agreements on the peaceful settlement of the situation in that region, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today.

To attain this goal, the USSR is undertaking active efforts on a bilateral and multilateral basis, including within the U.N. framework. It positively views various constructive initiatives, he said.

Commenting at TASS request on recent hints made in the U.S. and several other Western countries about the USSR's alleged involvement in Salvadoran developments, the ministry spokesman said:

"Indeed, Chilean Foreign Minister Hernan Felipe Errazuriz made several remarks in a conversation with journalists that no perestroyka was felt in the USSR's policy vis-a-vis Latin America and that this was confirmed by its purported involvement in the Salvadoran developments.

"Similar statements have been made by officials in the United States and several other Western countries."

Such declarations are groundless, the spokesman said. "In our view, their obvious objective is to divert world public attention away from those forces that bear chief responsibility for the emergence of the Central American conflict and the absence of tangible progress in the efforts to settle the conflict."

The spokesman said that the USSR's stance has repeatedly been spelled out in official statements by Soviet leaders. "It is well known: We favour a political settlement of all regional problems, preferably through agreements reached by the Central American states themselves, without any outside interference."

"The Soviet Union has repeatedly advanced specific proposals on the reduction or complete cessation of arms deliveries to Central American countries.

"Our country has also undertaken unilateral steps. Specifically, it took a decision, by arrangement with Managua, on suspending the delivery of Soviet weapons to Nicaragua from the beginning of next year."

It was announced during Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Nicaragua in October that the moratorium would remain in effect until at least April 1990, the spokesman said.

"The Soviet Union firmly adheres to its commitments. the USSR has not carried out nor is carrying out arms deliveries to other countries in the region either.

"This fully applies to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front in El Salvador," he said.

Shevardnadze on Settling Regional Conflicts

LD2611123189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1011 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, November 26, (TASS)—The example of the settlement of the Namibian problem shows that the most complex issues can be solved with political means, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze, stated in his interview which is published in the latest issue of the NEW TIMES magazine. One more time we have also satisfied ourselves that the world community and the United Nations organization are capable of acting consistently and decisively and presenting themselves as a united front in protecting and ensuring peoples' rights, he stressed.

"Just as in the treaty on medium-and shorter-range missiles we can see the precursor of a world free of nuclear wepaons, in the first painful, but real, changes for the better in the settlement of regional conflicts, we can see the evidence of the possibility of a world free from fratricidal quarrels, for which we strive so ardently and so insistently by putting the unconditional priority of general human values at the head of our policy", the Soviet minister said.

The Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, cessation of the military actions between Iraq and Iran, the Namibian settlement—that is a series of realistic achievements of the new political thinking and a powerful incentive to search for peace and stability in other regions. Those are the steps towards a world free of wars and armed conflicts, Eduard Shevardnadze believes.

United States & Canada

PRAVDA Previews Possible Malta Talks Topics

PM2411173789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA Political Observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "On the Threshold of the Soviet-U.S. Meeting. Ships of War, Aspirations of Peace"]

[Text] In a little while the following entry will appear in the chronicle of the most important events of 1989: Malta, 2-3 December—Working meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and U.S. President G. Bush.

Perhaps it is because the end of the year always disposes people toward summing up results and making plans for the future that December has recently been particularly noticeable in the sphere of productive contacts between the two countries' top leaders. The Washington summit meeting was held in December 1987. In December 1988 there was M.S. Gorbachev's visit to New York, during which the Soviet leader delivered a speech at the UN General Assembly session and met with outgoing U.S. President R. Reagan and with G. Bush, who was taking up this post. And now there is to be a Gorbachev-Bush working meeting, at which the U.S. leader will appear this time as head of state and of his country's government.

The popular U.S. weekly TIME calls the upcoming meeting a saltwater "summit." Well, we seem to have already gotten used to the little English word "summit." It means "meeting at the top." I believe that in this case the word "salt" from the author's lips does not signify an expectation of any unpleasantness. He simply means that the talks between the two presidents will take place off the shores of an island state on board warships—a U.S. ship and a Soviet ship in turn.

Why warships? Some people have been tempted to interpret this fact as a manifestation of some kind of bellicosity, almost as a show of force. Such an approach has nothing in common with the truth. This time the gray steel of modern cruisers has strictly peaceful symbolic meaning. The thing is that, according to international law, warships are regarded as the state territory of the country whose flags they fly. (A regulation which does not extend to ships of the passenger and merchant fleet.) So, for 2 days of unofficial talks, M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush will be alternately on USSR and U.S. territory. As regards the very idea of a meeting at sea, at some distance from dry land, I believe that this way of organizing things has the aim of ensuring that its participants have the greatest possible confidentiality and secrecy. The meeting will be conducted without a definite agenda. As emphasized in statements by both sides, the talks between the Soviet and the U.S. leaders will be of an unofficial nature and will be aimed at their getting better acquainted with each other and at deepening their understanding of each other's views. Accordingly, the task of having to reach agreements on any specific questions during the meeting is not being set.

The lack of an official agenda for the meeting has given rise to fears of the possibility of a "second Reykjavik" in certain Western press organs. It is said that in the Icelandic capital the dynamic and energetic Soviet leader, to the horror of the U.S. European allies, almost persuaded the U.S. President to agree to the total elimination of strategic nuclear arms. I believe that these arguments are historically incorrect. Looking at Reykjavik from the present day, you can see particularly clearly that an intellectual breakthrough was made during the relaxed conversations between the two countries' leaders in the Icelandic capital, without which both the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and the current talks on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms would hardly have been possible.

How did the agreement to hold an unofficial meeting of the top Soviet and U.S. leaders come about? After all, since Wyoming (September of this year) we know that the next Soviet-U.S. top-level meeting is to take place in late spring next year. We know that representatives of the two countries are doing substantial work at various talks, preparing the fundamentals of decisions in the most important areas of our relations, first and foremost relating to disarmament, in readiness for the next "summit."

The idea of holding an "interim," unofficial meeting, according to the Western press, came from the U.S. side. On his return to Washington from Paris in July, after the meeting of the "Group of Seven," President Bush sent M.S. Gorbachev a personal letter proposing such a meeting. The proposal was accepted. Explaining the motives behind this step on Washington's part, the U.S. newspapers and journals write that Bush is under strong pressure from the public and from political circles both in Western Europe and in the United States, circles that believe that the U.S. President is displaying a lack of resolve and is wasting a unique opportunity to further improve East-West relations. It does not, of course, matter who was first, who first said "let's meet."

What matters is that both sides felt a need for such an exchange of opinions and came to the conclusion that a confidential meeting between the two leaders will meet the interests of both countries and of the whole world. As for the USSR, in recent years it has constantly demonstrated in word and deed a sincere commitment to the development and deepening of Soviet-U.S. dialogue. There is no doubt that the forthcoming meeting will be a major political act. It will be an important stage in the preparations for the full-scale talks that will take place in the United States during M.S. Gorbachev's official visit. The meeting will promote the development and deepening of positive trends in Soviet-U.S. relations, which have such a beneficial effect both on the interests of our two countries and on the situation in the world as a whole.

After the period of "thoughtfulness" lasting more than 6 months, during which the "new team" in the White House was engaged in a study of the country's strategic priorities, the U.S. Administration is beginning to act more energetically. It seems that after studying all the "pros" and "cons" Washington came to the conclusion that perestroyka in the Soviet Union is a profound and irreversible process, that it opens up opportunities for creating a more secure and stable situation in Europe and throughout the world, and that this accords with U.S. interests, too. Complete unanimity apparently does not exist on the banks of the Potomac. Right-wing figures (such as U.S. Vice President D. Quayle) or those who have direct links with the military-industrial complex (such as Defense Secretary R. Cheney) insist that the Soviet Union is a "potential enemy" of the United States and try to sow doubt as to the correctness of the present line. But, again according to the U.S. press, recently the upper echelons of the administration have been adhering to the line proposed by Secretary of State J. Baker, who advocates more active and constructive East-West dialogue. In a recent appearance (in an interview for ABC television) the U.S. secretary of state stated that U.S. policy envisages promoting a "shift toward openness in Eastern Europe; a shift toward openness and reform in the Soviet Union, too." And this policy further envisages that "in this context we should not seek unilateral advantages, and it must be done in such a way as not to provoke instability."

And so the "interim," working, unofficial meeting of representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States is approaching. The group of experts accompanying the country's leaders is narrow. There is no agenda formulated beforehand. A frank discussion between two presidents, a wide, unconstrained survey of questions of interest to both sides, a philosophical, conceptual conversation. Despite the apparent lack of concreteness, something entirely tangible and substantial could emerge from such a free dialogue. The practice of international relations has shown that experts are prone to become bogged down in details, and that it is the political will of country leaders that can break the deadlock at talks or give them a new boost.

As President Bush stated, the advantage of this meeting will be that it will be possible in a tranquil atmosphere, "without fanfare," to discuss the whole range of problems in U.S.-Soviet relations and prepare and define an agenda for the summit meeting planned for next year. Looking at the forthcoming meeting from Moscow, one can surmise that such questions as security problems and the course of current disarmament talks will find a place in the conversations. Obviously various questions of bilateral relations will be touched on, among them trade and economic relations between the two countries (a sphere where the state of affairs lags substantially behind the generally positive development of the international situation).

Regional questions will also apparently be among the possible topics for discussion. It must be said that in this sphere, despite the considerable successes in quelling regional conflicts (southern Africa and the paths to a settlement which have taken shape in Cambodia and Lebanon), there are problems, too. It is well known that from time to time Washington makes complaints against us with regard to the situation in Central America, complaints which we believe to be unfounded. On the other hand, the international public quite rightly criticizes Washington for its policy on Afghanistan. What the United States is doing in giving continuing military and political support to the forces of irreconcilable opposition, and thereby taking the responsibility for the continuing bloodshed, can hardly be regarded as compatible with the position of a guarantor of the Geneva accords.

And observers in nearly all the world's newspapers believe that the leaders of the two great powers will, of course, compare their views on the dynamic processes developing in Europe. The democratic renewal of socialism in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, the profound integration processes in the western part of the "old continent"—all this is creating largely a new situation. As if in order to complete an enormous task in the remaining decade of the 20th century, the European peoples are stepping up the pace of political, social, and economic changes. For all its complex and contradictory nature, this is a historically determined and positive process. It is important that no one should be tempted to take advantage of the changes for his own narrowly ideological benefit. And of course, much depends on the course followed by the two great powers, the leaders of the two military-political alliances.

Shevardnadze on Gorbachev's Malta Agenda

LD2611223189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by unidentified correspondent; from the "Seven Days" program; introduced by Eduard Sagalayev]

[Text] [Sagalayev] In our program we try not only to sum up the past week and the present day, but also to talk about upcoming events. The main events of the next few days are Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Italy and his meeting with President Bush on warships in the Mediterranean. There are more than enough various assessments, forecasts, and commentaries. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, the USSR minister of foreign affairs, has given an interview to the "Seven Days" program.

[Unidentified correspondent] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, the leading mass media in the West are now expressing assumptions that the forthcoming, unplanned meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the U.S. is caused in large measure by the situation which is now developing in some socialist countries. But, in any event, are those assumptions justified or not? In your view, what influence will the events going on now in the GDR, Hungary,

Bulgaria, and Poland have on the course of talks in Italy and Comrade Gorbachev's meeting with President Bush?

[Shevardnadze] You know, I would not agree with such assumptions, that the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Bush is caused by the events which are happening in Eastern Europe. First, the question of organizing that meeting was under discussion for a long time. That is the first point. Second, we feel—and I think that the U.S. Administration also understands the aim of this meeting and, if you like, the concept of the meeting in exactly the same way—that the two leaders will discuss all the principal problems of the present day. Eastern Europe will probably not be an exception, as you have indicated, but a serious discussion will also take place on the problems of Western Europe and as we say, East-West and North-South relations. I would not single out one area, so to speak, as the main, central one, so to speak, and so on. Undoubtedly, since processes are going on and developing very dynamically in Eastern European countries, some emphasis may be placed and the discussion may be more in-depth.

In connection with the fact that much is changing, something will also have to be changed in policy regarding relations between Western countries and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. That is a component part of the dialogue, a component part of the agenda, which has not yet been formally listed.

Bush Cited on Preparations for Upcoming Meeting

PM2011142789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Consultations Held"]

[Text] Washington, 19 Nov—U.S. President G. Bush conferred with U.S. nongovernmental experts on the Soviet Union at his country residence at Camp David within the framework of preparations for the Soviet-U.S. meeting near the shores of Malta scheduled for early December.

According to a White House spokesman, over the past few days the president has also had several telephone conversations about the meeting with Prime Minister M. Thatcher of Britain, President F. Mitterrand of France, FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, and Prime Minister B. Mulroney of Canada.

In an interview broadcast on Saturday by Mutual Broadcasting System radio stations G. Bush declared that in his opinion the upcoming meeting with the Soviet leader is necessary above all "to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding" between the USSR and the United States. Pointing out that there is "no clear-cut agenda" for the meeting, the president said that the United States is interested in questions such as the dynamic changes in Eastern Europe and economic problems. G. Bush noted that he intends to raise questions pertaining to regional conflicts at the meeting.

Ship To Host Gorbachev-Bush Talks Described

LD2111115689 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Sevastopol November 21 TASS—The cruiser Slava will set out at the end of the week from the Black Sea fleet's main base in Sevastopol to the Mediterranean, where an unofficial meeting between Presidents Gorbachev and Bush will take place off Malta from December 2-3.

A TASS correspondent has visited the warship. Here is what he saw.

The doors of the main cabins on board the vessel are now marked: "President of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and "President of the United States of America". They are close to each other and identically furnished. Next to them is a saloon for tete-a-tete meetings. The officers' wardroom is set aside for plenary meetings of the two delegations.

According to international laws, a ship is regarded as the territory of the state it belongs to. What is this Soviet territory like? The Slava is 187 meters long and 21 meters wide. She has a displacement of over 9,000 tons and a complement exceeding 500 men.

She is the first ship of a new series of Soviet missile cruisers commissioned in January 1983. According to foreign experts, the cruiser is superior to foreign warships of the same class. The vessel has modern missile launchers, artillery turrets and torpedo tubes. She is equipped with up-to-date radio and electronic facilities.

Quite an amount of additional equipment was installed to cover the summit.

The cruiser will be accompanied by patrol vessel Pytlivy. The squadron will sail under the flag of Vice-Admiral Valentin Selivanov, chief of staff and first deputy commander-in-chief of the Black Sea Fleet.

"The crew is aware of the great honour and responsibility bestowed upon it," Valentin Selivanov told TASS. "Everything possible has been done to allow our guests to work fruitfully on board ship. The Black Sea navymen, as all Soviet people, hope that the summit will give a new impetus to the further development of relations between the USSR and the United States."

Cruiser 'Slava' Sets Off

LD2411075189 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The Soviet missile cruiser Slava, one of the two vessels due to host the

forthcoming Mediterranean superpower summit, set out today from its home port of Sevastopol, escorted by the patrol ship Pytlivy.

The Slava and the U.S. cruiser Belknap will accomodate Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush during their talks on December 2 and 3 near Malta.

Baltic Council Issues Appeal to Gorbachev, Bush

LD2211121989 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] On Saturday [17 November] the Baltic Council issued and forwarded an appeal to the presidents of the USA and the Soviet Union. We shall read the full text of the appeal:

At the end of the 1930s significant changes occured on the international stage. There was an increasing tendency to ignore the rights of smaller nations. Treaties which were signed between the Soviet Union and Germany in the period between 1939 and 1940 and the secret protocols which followed were put into effect immediately after the signing of the nonaggression treaty between the two powers on 23d August 1939. These documents sealed the fate of sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and led to the occupation, annexation, and incorporation of these states into the Soviet Union. The Baltic peoples have never accepted their occupation and annexation. This was made clear by the mass demonstration on August 23d 1989 where more than 2 million representatives of various nationalities linked their hands on the Baltic way.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are the only nations in Europe which to this date have not renewed the sovereignty they lost in the aftermath of World War II. Considering the fact that the Baltic question is not, in light of international law and international rights, an internal matter for the Soviet Union we call upon you to address this topic at your forthcoming discussions and to search for solutions which correspond to the world's interest in stability, security and progress.

We believe that the renewal of Baltic independence corresponds to the word and spirit of the Helsinki agreement. It will bring an end to the constant tension which has long existed in this part of Europe. The renewal of sovereignty for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania must be considered a fundamental prerequisite for cooperation among the nations of the Baltic basin. That, in turn, could become an important stabilizing factor in the context of European security.

Baker Letter to 'Latvian Charge d'Affaires'

PM2411162589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[O. Aleksandrov comment: "Embarrassing, but Necessary"]

[Text] The process of constructive development of Soviet-U.S. relations, which is gathering momentum, is being followed with great interest and hope throughout the world. The upcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush off the Malta coast is intended to impart a new major political impetus to the positive trends in these relations. Another incontrovertible fact which is recognized throughout the world is that it was precisely the process of revolutionary transformations in the USSR and our perestroyka which created the necessary preconditions for ending the "cold war," establishing and developing Soviet-U.S. dialogue, and improving the international climate. The U.S. leadership has also paid tribute to the revolutionary transformations in our country. The U.S. President and Secretary of State J. Baker speak unequivocally of their support for perestroyka, emphasizing that it accords also with the interests of the United States itself.

Unfortunately, the constructive changes in the U.S. Administration's approach to Soviet-U.S. relations do not provide an exhaustive picture.

Literally a matter of days ago a resolute protest was lodged with the U.S. ambassador in Moscow in connection with a provocative resolution adopted by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Nagorno-Karabakh issue. We cannot permit anyone, and that includes the U.S. lawmakers, to interfere in our internal affairs. And now there has been another relapse into "old" thinking, concerning the Soviet Baltic republics on this occasion. It is only to be regretted that this time it is the U.S. secretary of state himself acting in the role of the protagonist. In a letter addressed to the semi-mythical figure of the "Latvian charge d'affaires in Washington," J. Baker calls on the Baltic republics "to restore control over their future" and expresses the hope that "the forces of democracy in Latvia will bring about changes in the country." All this betrays a refusal to accept not just reality but also the truly democratic, progressive, and peaceful transformations which the Soviet state is implementing in the sphere of interethnic relations.

It is embarrassing even to have to say to such an unquestionably experienced and realistically-minded politician as U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker that he is engaging in crude interference in the internal affairs of another sovereign state, that this is impermissible, and that it cannot fail to have negative consequences for the Soviet-U.S. dialogue—a dialogue which now has such promising prospects thanks, inter alia, to the efforts of J. Baker himself. Has the U.S. leadership given no thought to such a simple question as: Who stands to gain from this? Is it really those who value and seek to ensure a stable and constructive development of relations with the Soviet Union? Or those who would like to return those relations to the bad times of confrontation and "cold war"? I believe that the answer is plain. The main thing is to translate this clear conclusion into practical policy.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on 1990 Pentagon Budget

PM2211124789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Billions—to the Pentagon"]

[Text] Washington, 20 Nov—The U.S. Congress House of Representatives has approved a draft law to allocate $286 billion for specific Pentagon programs for fiscal 1990. The Senate adopted a similar draft law 2 days earlier. Now it has been sent to the President for signing. The total U.S. military expenditure taking into account certain items in the budget of the Department of Energy and certain other departments will amount to $305 billion.

The Pentagon is being allocated $3.6 billion for the "Star Wars" program—almost $3 million less than in the last financial year. The administration's demands for appropriations to create a strategic nuclear missile for Trident-2 submarines and also strategic B-2 Stealth bombers have been reduced somewhat.

It is proposed to allocate $1.1 billion for deploying MX missiles with 10 warheads and for creating Midgetman missiles on railroad flatcars.

The Pentagon will also get funds to build 18 new F-14D fighters, and to conduct research for a program to create the "Osprey" vertical takeoff aircraft and the Phoenix missile.

Zorin Views U.S. Attitude To Military Cuts

LD2611214589 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Here's Valentin Zorin with "Moscow Viewpoint":

[Zorin] When the Pentagon's report on a considerable reduction of military expenditures in the Soviet Union was made public in Washington several days ago many U.S. commentators did not even try to hide their surprise. The stereotype of mistrust in the Soviet Union was obviously so deep-rooted in them that they questioned even the conclusions drawn by the U.S. Defense Department. Indeed, the department that has been intimidating the public with the Soviet threat for so many years has now arrived at the conclusion, on the strength of the concrete evidence, that the words of the Soviet leaders tally with their deeds. The Soviet Union is carrying out a program providing for a considerable reduction in its allocations for military purposes.

So what we're dealing with is the need to break the old stereotypes and this is apparently not an easy thing to do. Incidentally, we, Soviet journalists, also find it difficult to part with such stereotypes. One of the leading Soviet commentators wrote in one Moscow paper recently with the poorly disguised distrust about plans to curtail the Pentagon's military budget in the next 5 years announced by Washington. Yet the plan, the details of which were provided by the U.S. Defence Secretary Richard Cheney, can be regarded as one of the most remarkable political events in the post-war history of the United States. And I am convinced that this plan is the outcome of the processes taking place in the present-day world, rather than the reflection of someone's personal wishes.

Washington could not help but react to major cuts in the Soviet military potential announced by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech at the United Nations a year ago. True it took the U.S. leadership 12 months to decide to respond that initiative. It probably wanted to see how the Soviet decisions would be put into practice. Presently no one can have any doubts that the Soviet Union's cuts in the defense budget are a reality. I think the appearance of the Pentagon's report on the reduction in the Soviet Union's military spending and the simultaneous announcement of the Cheney plan is not a mere coincidence. Now that Washington sees that the Soviet Union's intentions are serious it is arriving at the conclusion that it has to reciprocate.

Economic considerations also play a certain role. Not only the Soviet Union but the United States as well will benefit from spending less on the defense purposes. The U.S.s cannot ignore the fact that their state debt has already reached $3 trillion or the fact that their national pride, the Rockefeller Center in New York, passed into the hands of Japanese bankers.

I am inclined to fully trust the Cheney plan to reduce the Pentagon's budget. I also take as a hopeful sign the fact that the plan was announced shortly before the opening of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush near Malta. I regard this as a good omen.

Mosbacher, Katushev Conclude Session on Trade

LD1611225589 Moscow TASS in English 2157 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 17 TASS—The signing of an agreed report on the development of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States marked the conclusion here of the work of the 11th session of the joint Soviet-U.S. commission on matters of trade.

The Soviet delegation to the session was led by Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev, the U.S. delegation was headed by U.S. Secretary of Commerce Robert E. Mosbacher.

At a news conference after the signing of the document by Katushev and Mosbacher, the Soviet minister summed up the results of the talks:

"Both sides proceeded from the fact that a new stage began in relations between the two countries, a stage determined by the consistent translation into life of the political line towards improved relations pursued by our presidents.

In turn, the U.S. secretary of commerce pointed out that important steps were taken by the two sides that would undoubtedly lead to better trade relations.

The parties agreed, among other things, to promote business contacts with the aim to develop in the Soviet Union consumer goods production, set up a working group for the preliminary consideration of questions which it would be advisable to reflect in a bilateral trade agreement.

It was decided to establish working groups to facilitate the development of cooperation in the field of tourism, discuss terms for foreign investments and study possibilities for expanding trade in connection with the development of the Far Eastern region.

The parties agreed to promote business exchanges between Soviet cooperatives and U.S. companies.

During the session, Katushev and Soviet Ambassador to the United States Yuriy Dubinin met U.S. Vice-President Dan Quayle. The Soviet minister had talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and other high-ranking officials.

News Conference

LD2011183989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; B. Kalyagin video report]

[Text] The 11th session of the joint Soviet-U.S. commission on trade issues has ended in Washington:

[Kalyagin] Important changes for the better have emerged in Soviet-U.S. trade relations. This was said at a press conference by the leaders of the two countries' delegations—U.S. Secretary for Commerce Mosbacher, and USSR Minister for Foreign Economic Relations Katushev. The parties agreed to start preliminary consultations to prepare for a trade agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States in the future which would be based on granting each other most-favored-nation status. The U.S. Administration is prepared to help U.S. business to expand cooperation with our country. Robert Mosbacher and Konstantin Fedorovich Katushev signed a joint protocol which outlines ways to expand Soviet-U.S. economic relations. How do the ministers themselves assess the accords which they have reached?

[Begin video recording] [R. Mosbacher, U.S. secretary for commerce, identified by screen caption, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] I think that today's events are a very important step toward cooperation and the development of mutually beneficial trade between our great countries.

[K.F. Katushev, USSR minister for foreign economic relations, identified by screen caption] The upcoming meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Bush influenced the commission's session. We are counting on setting up intergovernmental accords between the U.S. Administration and the Soviet Government by the time of the summer meeting between the leaders of our states, which will create favorable conditions for cooperation and enable the development of our trade, our economic cooperation, to be made more dynamic.

[Kalyagin] If our country obtains most-favored-nation status, are we prepared significantly to expand exports of our goods to the United States so that they are competitive here?

[Katushev] We shall have to carry out a great deal of work to make our goods competitive in the U.S. market. That's our main task if we wish significantly to develop our exports to the United States and our country's exports as a whole. [video shows signing ceremony; interviewees to camera] [end recording]

TASS on Pentagon's 'Secret' Shuttle Mission

LD2411023289 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 23 TASS—The Discovery space shuttle with five astronauts aboard was launched from Cape Canaveral in Florida state on Wednesday evening. The mission is part of a top secret Pentagon programme.

Following established practice, NASA does not announce the exact time of launching and the time and place of landing more than 24 hours before the end of the flight.

However, some particulars of the secret mission were leaked to the press. The discovery will be in space for four days and land at Edwards Air Force base in California.

According to experts, the shuttle carries a spy satellite worth 300 million dollars for the radio interception and bugging of high-frequency telephone conversations as well as for monitoring Soviet missile.

The Discovery's main task is to put this 2.5-tonne satellite into orbit.

It is the 32nd mission by U.S. space shuttles and the 5th under a Pentagon space programme. The Defence Department plans another three secret shuttle missions in the next 16 months.

U.S. Senate Agrees on Aid for Poland, Hungary

90UI0128A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Nov 89 p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov: "A Senate Decision"]

[Text] Washington, 14 November—Democratic and Republican leaders in the U.S. Senate reached a compromise agreement on Monday evening to give aid to

Poland and Hungary worth $738 million. Most of this sum—$657 million—is earmarked for Poland. The Senate expressed itself in favor of increasing allocations compared to the version of the conferees from the two houses, which a week ago decided to allocate $533 million for this purpose.

The decision by the Senate leadership was reached in obvious connection with the arrival of the Solidarity leader Lech Walesa in the United States. The Congress is trying to hurry through the lengthy process of allocating aid for Poland, giving due consideration to the fact that Walesa will soon be addressing a joint session of the houses.

The U.S. legislators are, in general, agreeable on the need to provide aid for Poland in order to stabilize the rampant inflation in the country's economy and promote the development of imports, provide assistance with food and in the fight to clean up the environment, and develop private investment programs. However, for several months now the Congress has been unable to approve a final package because of disagreements about its size.

Commenting on the cordial reception afforded on Monday by President Bush to the Solidarity leader, the CBS Television company, in particular, notes that "the question of U.S. aid for Poland remains unresolved. The Senate leaders have reached agreement on allocating a $738-million aid package for Poland and Hungary, but this is almost double the amount proposed by the Bush Administration. Despite the honors accorded to Walesa, on Tuesday the White House will begin work to reduce this package."

Roundtable Views Parliamentarians' U.S. Visit

LD1811233189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1550 GMT 18 Nov 89

["Roundtable of Members of Supreme Soviet Delegation to the United States" presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] [Zorin] Hello there, comrades. As you know, recently a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, paid an official visit to the United States. The members of this delegation are now in our studio. Let me introduce them: Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, its head; Veniamin Aleksandrovich Yarin, operator of the Nizhniy Tagil Metallurgical Combine and member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Women's Affairs, Family Protection, Mother and Child Care; Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, professor and lawyer, member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation, Legality, Law and Order; Professor Aleksandr Nikolayevich Krayko, member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing; and Professor Sergey Mikhaylovich Ryabchenko, deputy chairman of this committee.

The visit in question was not a run-of-the-mill visit. It was not an ordinary visit because this was practically the first meeting of representatives of the new Soviet parliament—not the rubber-stamp, ceremonial body, if one can put it that way, that to some extent existed before, but one of the real centers of political power in our country—with the U.S. Congress, also a most important center of power in the United States, as well as with U.S. Government leaders and prominent representatives of science, the public, literature, and with ordinary Americans. Overall, it was a meeting between Soviet parliamentarians and the United States. Many of you, comrade deputies, were in the United States for the first time. I would like to begin our discussion with your impressions from the trip, if you could put them succinctly and briefly. I have in mind both your political impressions, and your professional ones, and simply on the human level. Yevgeniy Maksimovich, if you will.

[Primakov] If I were you, Valentin Sergeyevich, I wouldn't start with me. It was not my first visit to the United States. Perhaps the others would like to speak first, those who were in the United States for the first time?

[Zorin] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich.

[Sobachak] I'll go first, if I may. This was indeed my first time, not just in the United States, but in any capitalist country; and I was struck above all by the following. First, universal amicability and enormous interest in our country and the changes that are taking place here. Second, the staggering patriotism of Americans: national flags at every step, people's desire to emphasize their allegiance to the country and its political institutions. And finally, as far as the standard of living, everyday life, and the day-to-day existence of Americans are concerned, on the one hand there is an extraordinarily high standard of living, of course. Take the high standard of living from the point of view of prices. For the Soviet people, they are simply unaffordable if you consider our salaries, at whatever rate you take, be it the official ruble rate, or the black market rate. For example, if admission to a museum cost $5, just imagine how difficult it would be for us, with our salaries, to live like that. If, for instance, at the official exchange rate, the cost of a ticket to The Hermitage cost R30, I do not know who of the Soviet people could afford it. But the Americans can afford it because their salaries are such that for them $5 represents no sum at all. As for my political impressions, we did not, in fact, go there just for a visit. We went mainly to exchange experiences, to see how Congress functioned, to make contacts. And I would like to focus on the strikingly high level of parliamentary activity and people's respectful treatment of one another in the process of congressional proceedings. I think we learned a lot during the trip.

[Zorin] Sergey Mikhaylovich.

[Ryabchenko] Like Anatoliy Aleksandrovich, I was in the capitalist world for the first time. Perhaps I have lost a bit of my capacity to be surprised, but it was nice that

the information I had about the United States coincided fairly closely with reality. That is the first point. Likewise, the openness and sociability of Americans—I have had contacts with them in meetings at various international conferences—came as no surprise to me either. Among the strongest impressions was the serious attitude toward our delegation by congressmen, senators, and leading representatives of the U.S. public. For instance, the strong contingent of U.S. economists and public figures that turned up for a meeting with us in Los Angeles certainly came as a surprise to me. It was very nice to see a very strong contingent of American representatives at a meeting in New York at the Society for International Relations.

All in all, there was a serious and thoughtful approach. They really are interested in the new-look Soviet Union. Everywhere one could detect a desire on their part to at least somehow contribute to the Soviet Union's acquisition of a new look guaranteeing political and economic stability throughout the world. I hope that this interest on their part was sincere.

As for the friendliness of ordinary people that we met, I had no doubts on that score. As for purely external impressions, what I found new was the absence of uninterrupted stretches of fencing, even in U.S. villages, and the striking tidiness. That was probably the thing I evidently had not grasped from my previous acquaintance with the United States from books and other information. I was pleasantly struck by it.

[Zorin] Thank you. Veniamin Aleksandrovich.

[Yarin] Well, generally speaking, I also saw that world for the first time. But, you know, I was not staggered in the way people usually say they are when they get back from the United States, that everything there is so unusual and so on and so forth. The warmheartedness with which we were immediately greeted remained in my heart more than anything else that we later encountered on our trip. Most of all I was struck by the large hands of a farmer; he had a palm like a shovel. It was the strong hand of a man who knew he was boss. They shook our hands with such tenderness. And many of them had travelled dozens of kilometers to see the Russians, to see the Russian lads. That has remained with me more than anything else.

[Zorin] Thank you. Aleksandr Nikolayevich.

[Krayko] For me it is most difficult of all, because almost all the impressions have been mentioned. It was also my first trip to the United States and to any capitalist country. In the political area, a very profound impression was left on me by the serious attitude of U.S. politicians and ordinary people toward the changes taking place in our country. I got the impression that this attitude is much warmer and more heartening than even the attitude during the war when we were allies. It seems to me that the Americans, while very concerned about the extent to which these processes are irreversible, are nevertheless ready for real cooperation—like us, of course—and moreover not temporary cooperation but cooperation forever.

Now, as for impressions additional to those already mentioned, I was to some extent shocked that the United States was quite different from what I sometimes used to learn and hear from statements by certain cultural figures of ours that it's all sex and rock over there. It has to be said that of 30 TV channels which I think I counted in Los Angeles or New York, only one channel had light music. During the day, and even in the evening up to about midnight, you can't see any scenes of violence on the screen; at the times when I, at any rate, had an opportunity to watch television—no scenes of violence or sex. And this came as a surprise to me.

[Primakov] I would like to say the following. I am the only one who can compare the United States—the attitude of the United States toward us during the preperestroyka period and their attitude toward us now, because among all those present here, I am the only one who has been to the United States many, many times... [unidentified speaker, interrupting] apart from.... [Primakov] yes, with the exception of the host—I am speaking about the members of the delegation. It is very good that you have brought up our host, as I would like to ask him if he agrees with what I am about to say.

Before, in virtually all conversations that were held there, anxiety and, I would say, even fear of some unpredictable turn of events in the future were in evidence. People were constantly talking about rules of behavior in this or that situation, about how to avoid clashes, how to avoid war—and that one was hanging over us as well. Now there is absolutely nothing like this. I didn't even imagine that the situation with regard to this could change so quickly. My colleagues have already spoken about the complete benevolence—it really is so. Benevolence and the very huge interest that is coming not out of curiosity or inquisitiveness that might be typical of Americans, but from an interest in our perestroyka, because through it the United States is obviously looking for some kind of forecasts for their fate too, as this perestroyka touches everyone.

I would say that they are very well informed about the events that take place in our country. This also, while not surprising me, was, in any case, memorable, and it is a contributory element of the impressions. They know what is going on, they know about our difficulties, and the majority of those we met consider that these difficulties must be, that they can be overcome, in the first place. It was even sometimes rather awkward when we were told: "Come off it. Generally you are a real country; you will overcome all these things." It might be that they were influenced to some degree by information that they were or are receiving from some individuals, but in principle, it was the confidence and benevolence that we will really be able to stand on our own two feet.

[Yarin] Previously, we used to come, and usually the visit was organized in this way: The leader of the delegation spoke, the whole delegation was silent, and then everyone left. But here this openness—and we came to them with open hearts—this contact, in general, struck both us and them.

[Zorin] Yes, I can certify that the deputies spoke— well, to put it mildly—not less than the leader of the delegation. As far as your question is concerned, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. I can say that after many years of visiting the United States annually—and I won't be afraid of using this word—I was stunned by the turn that had taken place so swiftly in the depths of the United States in respect to the Soviet Union.

[Primakov] You must excuse me for interrupting you; I think the impression will not be complete. I don't know about my friends—if they agree with my point of view or not—the impression would not be complete if things are presented as if everyone kept standing up and applauding us and everything was only...

[Sobchak, interrupting] That the atmosphere was all hunky dory...

[Primakov] Absolutely hunky dory. The United States is varied. We are speaking about the predominant part, maybe, and about the predominant reaction. But there were also—and you might tell about it better—there were somewhat disappointing moments, but clearly they didn't prevail. [passage omitted]

[Zorin] I would like to discuss the following subject. This conversation is taking place before the upcoming meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Bush, his closest advisers, and the U.S. secretary of state. You, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, and some other members of our delegation, met with the President in Washington at the White House and with the secretary of state at the State Department. I would like to ask you about the atmosphere in which these meetings took place, and in what mood you found the head of the U.S. state. It seems to me that on the eve of the USSR-U.S. summit meeting this is becoming of special interest.

[Primakov] Well, I and some of my colleagues were together at the meeting with President Bush. Admittedly, the meeting was absolutely colored by good will. [video shows Primakov delegation at meeting with Bush] That was quite clear. And then the president—and this seems to me very important—was, on the one hand, very interested in the processes that are under way in our country. And it was very pleasant to hear from him personally during a news conference, at which he declared, incidentally, that this intermediary summit meeting would be held in Malta, that the meeting with our delegation, as he said, had convinced him once more that the hands of the clock of perestroyka cannot be put back. It was pleasant that the meeting with us left this impression because we talked to him absolutely frankly about our difficulties, among other things. And this realistic tone of conversation, this realism, and, if you like, the absence of any veneer of propaganda on our part, allowed us to establish contact with him immediately and in human terms, this could be felt very well.

What was memorable about this conversation? The first point—I would like to stress especially—is that the President described the pause which occurred in relations with us after the new U.S. Administration came to power, not only as a necessary, from his point of view, period of time to reflect on the path that had been covered before, but also to get ready for new, so to speak, future developments. He said this quite clearly. Consequently what is meant are future developments. And second, he places a very high value on the Soviet leader, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He stressed that he had met him many times and is expcting a very great deal from the meeting with him in the future. These are the points that I wanted to note.

[Zorin] Is your impression from your conversation at the White House that the atmosphere on the eve of this meeting is favorable?

[Primakov] Without a doubt, the atmosphere for the meeting is favorable. If you ask me now simply as someone who for a certain period of time, at least before my transfer to the Supreme Soviet and election as chairman of one of the chambers, was professionally involved in international affairs, I think that, in general, if no new breakthroughs occur at the meeting itself, it will without doubt be a preparation, a good preparation, so to speak, for the implementation of such new breakthroughs at the next summit that will take place.

[Zorin] Thank you.

[Sobchak] Could I just say something, Valentin Sergeyevich, about this meeting? I attended the meeting, and I'd like to add to what Yevgeniy Maksimovich has said—the meeting was not simply a matter of official protocol—this is so to such an extent that at the end of the meeting the President started to talk to us on a purely human level about his difficulties in relations with the congress, about how difficult it is for him to work with congressmen who speak more with their electorate than matters of state in mind!

[Zorin] Perhaps he wanted to teach you something, eh, Anatoliy Aleksandrovich?

[Sobchak] Yes, he even gave us a tip—that we shouldn't make their mistake, and establish such a legislature! Well, admittedly the tip was...

[Primakov, interrupting] At the same time, do you remember when he said: I also have the opportunity to meet them outside a public context and put pressure on them and so on..!?

[Yarin] And they confirmed that later!

[Sobchak] Yes, yes they did. They said they came to an agreement!

[Primakov] They came to an agreement! [passage omitted] Of course, there were some curious incidents as well, such as when it was announced that an intermediate meeting was to take place off Malta, I mean the summit meeting. It was then commentaries started coming out, including sensational ones, because one must know the U.S. press often has a weakness for the sensational. One of the comments was: Why on warships? Doesn't that show the division of the world into spheres of influence?

[Sobchak] They want to divide it up and to come to an agreement!!

[Primakov] Ha! Ha! Or there were individual comments almost to the effect that we will be asking the United States for something, for some huge help that we need now as a life-saving injection, etc. Well, with the President—coming back to our conversation with the President—he put the question himself: What do you think, in what spheres could we offer the most support to the Soviet Union now? And he agreed with our formulation of the question about the fact that they are: First, the sphere of arms reduction, and it's not actually a question of unilateral help to anyone, but help to everyone and to us. This is absolutely clear now, I must say.

Then there is the lifting of the discriminatory measures affecting trade relations. It would be a very big help to us as well, but at the same time the U.S. business world wants the same, and we came across it there. [passage omitted]

[Zorin] Our time is up, and of course, we did not manage to deal with all aspects of such a greatly difficult and necessary trip lasting many days, we just dealt with a few of the aspects. I'd like to ask you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, in conclusion to try briefly to pinpoint a common denominator and single out the main points that you could say about this.

[Primakov] I think that is an impossible task. We would need to start a second television program. But perhaps I could put it in shorthand form. First, there was the amicability. I am just summing up what my colleagues and friends were saying, the comrades who went with me on the trip. First, amicability. Second, the good level of knowledge they have about us. Third, the way the overwhelming majority of people in the United States have now, if you like, turned their face toward us as a result of our restructuring—because there can be no other reasons here for this reorientation, if I can call it that. Also the United States is multifaceted: One must not forget this or shut one's eyes to it, naturally. Also for me it was a chance to meet my colleagues with whom we worked very closely and very well there. Over here, we sit in different places and regrettably don't have the contact that we had during the trips. And I got to know a very large number of people—all of them, all the people here, and people who are absent. We had a very amicable team. [passage omitted]

Northeast Asia

Shevardnadze Statement on South Kurile Islands

LD2411115789 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The attention of the world mass media was attracted to the meeting of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and a group of Soviet and foreign women journalists in Moscow on November 18. In particular, the meeting dealt with the issue of Soviet-Japanese relations and Japanese claims to the South Kurile islands.

Since some news organisations have given different interpretations of Shevardnadze's statement on that issue, a TASS diplomatic correspondent asked the USSR Foreign Ministry for a verbatim report of the meeting. According to the report, the minister made the following statement:

"Our position is that these islands belong to us. What is the way out? One of the deputies (of the USSR Supreme Soviet) has proposed joint economic activity. An interesting idea. Incidentally, we propose to the Japanese to open joint ventures, maybe not giants in the beginning, but to open joint ventures on these islands, to jointly export. Such proposals have been made. No positive decision has been received yet.

And if these islands belong to us, then are there grounds to speak about transfer and return? There are no grounds.

"Then the minister said: "We are for continuing dialogue, for solutions to promote the development of our relations with Japan, with this surprisingly interesting country, a country which has scored tremendous successes in all fields of life and with which we are building good-neighbourly relations." [quotation marks as received]

Troop Withdrawal Preparations Begin in Mongolia

LD2411225389 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Ulaanbaatar November 24 TASS—Preparations for the second stage of troop withdrawal, planned for the next year, have begun in Soviet units temporarily stationed on Mongolian territory.

Three divisions are to be withdrawn from Mongolia between 1989-1990 under agreement between the Soviet and Mongolian Governments. Experience gained in the first withdrawal stage, which ended this year, is now being put to use.

The two sides are coordinating the conversion of military compounds being vacated. Most of them will become small enterprises with flexible technology. Soviet servicemen are now adapting part of facilities for such enterprises.

The two sides planned joint actions in transforming military compounds for peaceful purposes. The conversion is acquiring tangible outlines.

Soviet servicemen are restoring the natural landscape around the compounds, eliminating test ranges, trenches and dugouts.

Near East & South Asia

Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Lebanon

LD2511204889 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry circulated the following statement here today:

On November 25, a new president was elected in Lebanon. A new government was also confirmed. Thus, in accordance with the law and on a constitutional basis, institutions of power have been restored in Lebanon. The country has emerged from the most acute and dangerous stage of the crisis. The necessary conditions have been set up for Lebanese of all religious beliefs and convictions to begin a practical solution of their problems in accordance with the Charter of National Reconciliation.

The positive changes become possible because Lebanese leaders in their absolute majority have stepped over their confessional ambitions and displayed a sense of true patriotism and understanding of national duty.

No one can now doubt that the Lebanese people are aiming toward national revival, and no one shall try to solve internal problems with the force of arms.

The fact that the development of the situation in Lebanon is taking on a promising character shall be credited on the Committee of Three of the League of Arab Nations, and on those Arab states, especially the neighbouring ones, whose constructive actions helped take Lebanon out of the deadlock.

The U.N. Security Council, its permanent members and the entire international community energetically worked in this direction.

Many in the Soviet Union are convinced that if numerous states and forces continue unanimous cooperation for the benefit of Lebanon, thus promoting new positive trends in international relations, a long period of internal differences and instability in Lebanon will be left behind, and this revived country will occupy a fitting position in the Arab world and the international community of nations.

Shevardnadze, Iran's Mottaki Hold 'Frank' Talks

LD2511205289 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met visiting Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister M. Mottaki here on Saturday [25 November].

Mottaki arrived in Moscow for consultations in the Soviet Foreign Ministry Carrying a message to Shevardnadze from Iranian Foreign Ministry 'Ali Akbar Velayati.

Shevardnadze and Mottaki had a frank discussion of current Soviet-Iranian relations and cooperation in different spheres.

The Soviet Union and Iran, acting in the spirit of good-neighborliness, mutual understanding and agreements reached during 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani's visit to the Soviet Union in June of 1989, are consistently developing bilateral cooperation, which is becoming increasingly diverse and dynamic, it was said.

The two diplomats also discussed several international and regional problems of mutual interest.

They paid special attention to Iran-Iraqi settlement. Mottaki informed Shevardnadze about recent meetings with U.N. Secretary- General's Representative Jan Elliasson in Tehran.

Shevardnadze emphasised the importance of further efforts toward practical agreements for the implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 598 which would ease tensions in relations between Iran and Iraq.

He emphasised the role of the United Nations, its secretary general and his special representative in political settlement between Iran and Iraq.

Mottaki praised the Soviet Union for pursuing a constructive policy toward peace and calm in the region.

The sides decided to continue bilateral contacts to discuss ways of achieving Iran-Iraqi settlement.

Shevardnadze and Mottaki had constructive discussions of the situation in and around Afghanistan.

Eduard Shevardnadze said that a concrete and comprehensive plan for a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan proposed by President Najibullah in Belgrade opens new opportunities to stop the bloodshed and establish peace and calm in Afghanistan.

Resolution 598 Given 'High Priority'

LD2511114289 Tehran IRNA in English 0630 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Tehran, Nov. 25, IRNA—Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister for International Affairs Manuchehr Mottaki, currently in Moscow, met with his Soviet counterpart

Vladimir Petrovskiy Friday and discussed issues of mutual interests, it was announced here Saturday.

Petrovskiy said Moscow in its foreign policy considerations gives high priority to the UN Resolution 598 on establishment of peace between Iran and Iraq.

Moreover, the Iranian official briefed his Soviet counterpart on the Islamic Republic's latest initiative on simultaneous withdrawal of Iraqi forces from occupied Iranian territories and exchange of Iraqi and Iranian POW's.

Petrovskiy assured that the Soviet Union supports all constructive efforts made in connection with the implementation of the resolution.

Mottaki, heading a political delegation, left here Thursday evening for an official visit to Moscow.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Leaves for Syria

LD2711111989 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by Absamat Masaliyev, member of the Soviet parliament and first secretary of the Kirghiziya Communist Party Central Committee, left here for Damascus today for an official visit at the invitation of the People's Council of the Syrian Arab Republic.

"Our visit will be made within the framework of regular contacts between the two countries' parliaments", the leader of the delegation said before departure.

"Leaving for Syria we know that we are going to meet our long-standing and staunch friends. The Soviet Union and Syria have been for decades brought together by close ties, the strength and reliability of which have been confirmed by time.

"We have a good legal basis in the form of the 1980 treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Syria. All this gives Soviet-Syrian contacts the character of partnership, which meets the interests of the two peoples and is of benefit to the efforts towards ensuring peace and security in the Middle East.

The delegation is to deliver a personal message from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to President Hafiz al-Asad. The message deals with the fundamental matters of international politics and bilateral relations.

"We shall have substantive talks with our Syrian counterparts, representatives of the leadership and public of Syria.

"Of course, we shall describe the large-scale perestroyka processes taking place in the Soviet Union and the Soviet Parliament activities.

"For our part it will be interesting to us to learn about tasks being tackled by the Syrian people and the work of the People's Council of Syria.

"There will be, of course, a detailed talk on the further development of interparliamentary contacts and in this context the interaction of the two countries' parliamentarians in the efforts to radically improve the international situation. The Soviet Union and Syria act from identical or quite close positions on all cardinal issues of our time.

"We are confident that the forthcoming visit will contribute to deepening Soviet-Syrian cooperation."

Tarasov Holds Discussion With 'Arafat in Tunis

LD2711124389 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Tunis November 27 TASS—Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) Executive Committee Yasir 'Arafat received visiting Soviet Assistant Foreign Minister and Special Representative on the Middle East Gennadiy Tarasov here on Sunday [27 November].

Commenting on the meeting, the Palestinian news agency WAFA pointed out that it was an important event on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. Summit, at which the situation in the Middle East will be discussed among other things.

WAFA also reported that Tarasov conveyed to 'Arafat an important message from the Soviet leadership about the Palestinian problem. The Soviet representative informed 'Arafat about Soviet contacts with various countries, including the United States, on the crisis in the Middle East.

The PLO met all the demands necessary to boost the peace process. However, Israel's stubborness is a major obstacle on the way to peace in the Middle East, 'Arafat said.

WAFA stressed that the coordination of stands between the Soviet and Palestinian leaderships is of exceptional importance, as is the role of European countries in Middle East affairs.

Afghanistan To Release 2 Soviet Prisoners of War

LD2611124289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] It has become known from official sources in Islamabad that two Soviet prisoners of war will be handed over tomorrow in Peshawar to the Soviet ambassador in Pakistan by the Afghan opposition. Andrey Lopukh and Valeriy Prokapchuk, the prisoners, are being released with assistance of Prime Minister of Pakistan Bhutto. In connection with this, the Afghan Government has decided to take a step of goodwill in return and release a big group of Mujahidin.

State of Emergency in Afghanistan Extended

LD2111225289 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Kabul November 21 TASS—The BAKHTAR NEWS AGENCY today circulated a decree by Afghan Persident Najibullah about an extension of the state of emergency in the country for six months.

The scope of aggression against the sovereign state on the part of Pakistan and its supporters is widening despite Afghanistan's strict observance of the provisions of the Geneva Accords, the decree points out.

The provisions of Afghan rebel groups with the newest types of weapons is being continued. On the strength of the powers vested in the president by the Loya Jirgah and proceeding from the need to defend the country's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence, the state of emergency is extended for another six months.

If the causes which bring about a complex situation in the country are removed, the state of emergency may be lifted at any moment, the decree emphasises.

U.S. Afghan Stance Seen as Counterproductive

PM2311114589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Yuriy Glukhov "View From Moscow": "Baseline"]

[Text] Reports from Afghanistan are still reminiscent of military communiques. The armed opposition's bombardments of Kabul, the renewed but faltering offensive on Jalalabad, the seige of Khowst, and sorties in other regions are the events of the past few days.

The subject of Afghanistan has not disappeared from the pages of the Soviet press either. The extremely gross mistakes made in connection with our direct involvement in the armed conflict are being brought to light. The question of our debt to our men who served in Afghanistan—those who died and those who survived—and to their families is being raised very seriously. The moral aspects of our involvement in the Afghan events are being discussed. That is easy to understand. The pain of loss is great and the lesson learned bitter.

But are the mistakes of the past not projected too easily and frequently onto the present in our press? Are the assessments made with regard to the Afghan leadership, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the disposition of forces in Afghanistan, and the country's path and prospects of development not too hasty and superficial, as they also were in the past? After all, the Afghan conflict is not yet a closed chapter. The confrontation continues. Its outcome and our desire to maintain traditionally friendly Soviet-Afghan relations in the future and protect the tranquillity of our southern borders can hardly be a matter of indifference. The most important task at the present stage is to decide how to develop the colossal breakthrough which has now been achieved in the Afghan question on the basis of the new political thinking.

I am referring to the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country. It is the start of a qualitatively new stage in the development of the Afghan conflict and of a switch toward resolving this conflict by peaceful means. As is well known, the Geneva agreements aim to stabilize the situation in the region and rule out the possibility of military conflicts and subversive actions. The withdrawal of the Soviet military contingent is a real, serious contribution to military detente and to lowering the threshold of confrontation.

So the situation surrounding Afghanistan is developing within new parameters. There is an international legal aspect to resolving the Afghan crisis. The Geneva agreements regulate in detail the conduct of the sides involved in the conflict in order to totally prevent not only confrontation but also any attempts to destabilize the situation. The agreements enshrine the principles of relations between the Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and, in particular, noninterference and nonintervention.

There are international guarantees of the Geneva Accords and the settlement process evolved in Geneva. The USSR and the United States are both guarantors. The United Nations is also directly involved in the peace-making efforts. A program of international aid to Afghanistan has been drawn up through the United Nations.

For its part, Kabul has put forward a broad program of national reconciliation involving all the Afghan political forces concerned. It is proposed to hold an all-national peace conference to this end.

In order to settle the external aspects of this problem, the Republic of Afghanistan proposes convening an international conference and drafting an accord on terminating deliveries of all types of weapons to the warring groupings so as to ensure a cease-fire and protect and guarantee Afghanistan's permanently neutral and demilitarized legal status.

Finally, there is the humanitarian aspect of the Afghan conflict. "The reality of the situation in Afghanistan is still the tragedy of its people. There is no Afghan family which has not experienced for itself the brutality of this conflict," UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar said in his report. In the last 8 months alone, more than 4 million artillery shells and missiles have been fired at cities, villages, and government troop positions. More than 2,500 civilians have been killed and some 6,000 wounded.

It must be said that the powerful boost given to regional international detente by the Geneva agreements is gradually losing its force. The reason for this is the obstructionist stance taken by the United States, Pakistan, and a number of other countries.

To be honest, I cannot understand official Washington's rejection of the Afghan Government in Kabul. This rejection was made clear at the recent meetings between a delegation of Soviet journalists, which included myself, and the U.S. vice president and secretary of state. I cannot understand it because this regime, this Afghanistan is a full signatory to the Geneva agreements and a full participant in the Geneva process.

It seems that the United States is taking the same deadlocked attitude on this issue as it is in relation to the PLO. It is clear, for example, that a solution to the Near East conflict is impossible without PLO participation. Nevertheless, contrary to common sense and the opinion of the international community, Washington and Tel Aviv are attempting to ignore this organization as a partner in the talks on a Near East settlement. It took more than 20 years before the Americans finally made their first official contacts with the PLO.

I also cannot understand why the United States is opposed to military detente of the Afghan situation. Its idea of "negative symmetry"—termination of arms supplies to the conflicting sides in Afghanistan—has been supported by the Soviet Union. So why discard this idea now, when such measures are urgently necessary?

One forms the impression that the Afghan problem has been farmed out to the CIA. It is through the CIA that the Afghan opposition receives as much as $500 million every year. To all appearances, this most serious political regional problem affecting the lives of many peoples is being solved at the level and by the methods of Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North, the hero of "Irangate." The cost of this "approach" for the United States itself is clear.

There is no doubt that stabilization of the situation in Southwest Asia is in the United States' long-term interests. The gamble on ill-assorted Afghan groupings squabbling among themselves, sabotage, terror, and subversive activity merely introduces another large destabilizing element into the region, with all the possible consequences. Who can predict how the undermining of the situation will end for Pakistan, for example?

The CIA is encouraging Islamic fundamentalists. But the Lebanese experience shows that this is playing with fire. The U.S. hostages in Lebanon are the victims of fundamentalist groupings.

U.S. arms supplies are also having a boomerang effect. It is well known that the Americans have become the target of their own "Stinger" missiles, which have found their way from Afghanistan to the Persian Gulf.

In Washington William Bennett, director of the office to combat drugs, told us about the extensive campaign launched by the United States in this sphere. But it is well known that the leaders of the "Alliance of Seven" are very big opium producers (more than 800 tonnes per year). And they are under the wing of the CIA and even the State Department, which has its own "envoy" to the Peshawar "seven." A strange picture, surely?

Maybe the situation surrounding Afghanistan is simply the object of a political game. But in that case, all the talk about the need for and possibility of U.S.-Soviet cooperation in resolving regional conflicts, which I also heard in Washington at a high level, is left hanging in mid-air. But this kind of cooperation is indeed necessary. What is more, it has already borne fruit, in southern Africa and in the Afghan issue. We must not simply roll backwards. We must observe the accords reached and go further to reach a new level.

East Europe

Polish Premier Mazowiecki Continues Visit, Talks

Meets With Ryzhkov, Accords Signed

PM2611152389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Friendship and Cooperation"]

[Text] Talks were held in the Kremlin 24 November between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Congratulating T. Mazowiecki on his election as chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, N.I. Ryzhkov said that the Soviet Union welcomes the visit by the head of the Polish Government, viewing it as a step toward continuing the traditions of friendship and good-neighborliness that have typified relations between the Soviet and Polish peoples. A firm foundation for these relations was laid during the years of the struggle by the two countries' peoples against Hitlerite fascism, and in the subsequent postwar decades of their active and fruitful cooperation on the basis of the principles of equality and respect for mutual interests. T. Mazowiecki said that the new Polish Government created on the basis of a broad coalition and the country's public also attach great importance to the visit, which serves as proof that the line of strengthening Soviet-Polish relations remains a fundamental element in his government's policy. Poland, T. Mazowiecki stressed, firmly intends to observe all existing agreements—above all, its commitments within the Warsaw Pact—and to remain a member of CEMA.

The heads of government exchanged information about the features of the current stage of perestroyka in the

USSR and the profound transformations taking place in Poland's sociopolitical and socioeconomic life.

There was a comprehensive discussion on questions of Soviet-Polish cooperation bearing in mind the changes taking place in both countries and in the world. Particular attention was devoted to measures to improve the mechanism of bilateral economic relations and to make them mutually advantageous.

Complete mutual understanding was reached regarding the fact that under the conditions of the profound transformations in the national economies of the USSR, Poland, and other socialist countries, there is an emerging need for perestroyka in the mechanism of economic cooperation, which should correspond to the nature of economic reforms. Favorable conditions will thereby be created for active participation in the development of economic, scientific, and technical links between independent economic units—enterprises and organizations—and for improvements in their effectiveness. The sides agreed that a phased transition to mutual settlements in freely convertible currency based on world prices is of decisive importance in setting up the new cooperation mechanism. This will make it possible for both countries to become more actively involved in world economic links and in the international division of labor.

The heads of government advocated the need for a fundamental renewal of the system of multilateral cooperation within the CEMA framework and for more active involvement by CEMA countries in the integration processes developing on the European Continent.

A number of specific questions of Soviet-Polish trade and economic relations in the forthcoming 5-year period were also examined.

N.I. Ryzhkov and T. Mazowiecki noted the importance of expanding direct contacts between Soviet and Polish citizens and expressed their readiness to promote favorable conditions for this.

The sides examined the question of social security for Soviet and Polish citizens living on Polish and Soviet territory respectively, and agreed that preparations will be accelerated on a draft agreement on this question.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were: N.P. Laverov and S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister; and V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland; and on the Polish side: Ministers J. Ambroziak, B. Kaminski, M. Swiecicki, J. Osiatynski, A. Hall, and T. Syryjczyk; B. Kulski, secretary of state at the Polish Foreign Ministry; Deputy Ministers M. Dombrowski, W. Kuczynski, and S. Amanowicz; A. Drawicz, chairman of the Committee for Radio and Television; M. Niezabitowska, government press spokesperson; S. Dlugosz, deputy chairman of the Central Planning Administration; and S. Ciosek, Polish ambassador to the USSR.

At the end of the talks agreements were signed between the Soviet and Polish Governments on cooperation in the sphere of environmental protection.

PAP Interviews Gorbachev Before Talks

LD2411193389 Warsaw PAP in English 1813 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 24—In the afternoon today Mikhail Gorbachev received at the Kremlin Poland's Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki.

Shortly before the meeting Gorbachev granted a short interview for PAP.

Asked what he had to say to Poles. The Soviet leader answered: "To continue what has been started. I will tell this to your premier.

"We have a big capital now which should be multiplied, Gorbachev continued. Today everybody looks in our direction, at the development in our relations. Thus we should multiply this and not let accumulated things be wasted. Presently there are new relations between our nations, between our countries. I am convinced it brings profits to both sides.

"I, do not mean capital in the form of some credits for debts, for me that capital lies in our relations. I mean the capital in the broad sense of the word, or even more I would say, the human capital. The relations, I will repeat, have changed for better and thoroughly at that. But yet, signals reach me which arouse my concern," Gorbachev stated.

The Soviet leader stopped at this point as Premier Mazowiecki entered the cabinet just then. Gorbachev greeted him with warm words.

The talk started, the beginning of which could be heard by journalists.

"I will try, Gorbachev stated, not to repeat what Premier Ryzhkov already told you. Some people may consider it strange that I want to wish you luck, but in fact I do wish you success, luck. I think that no less do we want the government, the nation, the nation close to us, to be successful, the government to rule successfully."

"We are also very interested in the success of perestroyka. We come here with best wishes, with best feelings," Premier Mazowiecki replied.

Mazowiecki-Gorbachev Meeting 24 Nov

PM2611150589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With T. Mazowiecki]

[Text] On 24 November M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic [PPR], who is on an official visit to Moscow.

The Soviet leader welcomed the head of the Polish Government, who is visiting our country for the firt time. In the light of the major changes that have recently taken place in Poland, he said, it is especially important to deepen mutual understanding on fundamental issues concerning Soviet-Polish relations, to ensure adequately from both sides their further successful development. M.S. Gorbachev stated: We value the fact that from its very first steps the government of the broad coalition clearly expressed its desire to strengthen and broaden the Soviet-Polish ties.

The development of good-neighborly relations with Poland is a permanent strategic line of Soviet foreign policy. Much has been achieved here. It is thanks to our consistent exercising of mutual respect for the interests and views of one another, of the principles of equality, noninterference, and mutual benefit that relations between our countries have become better, purer and healthier then ever. Great service, the Soviet side noted, has been done in this respect by Wojciech Jaruzelski, the PPR president, by the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], and by other Polish political forces and circles, including the realistically thinking officials of the Roman Catholic Church. The consonance of Soviet perestroyka and Polish renewal has given and is giving a powerful stimulus to the development of our links. Despite the essential specificity of the situation in our countries, quite a number of similar problems arise, both in the socioeconomic and in the sociopolitical spheres. Of course, our conceptions of how to solve them are largely different, but this is a stimulus for, rather than an obstacle to, fruitful relations.

We may diverge in our views, we have different experience of life, different orientations in our views of the world, and different political orientations. But an understanding of the most important thing, that the Soviet Union and Poland have a mutual interest in goodneighborliness, creates the basis for mutual understanding on a wide range of questions, beginning with philosophical and political problems and extending to exclusively practical problems of cooperation.

Starting from these fundamental considerations, and respecting the Polish people's choice of the paths for their development, the Soviet side is wide open for close cooperation with the new leadership of Poland, as with all Polish political forces, with public and religious figures, with trade unions and other democratic organizations. Such cooperation accompanied by respect for the sovereignty, national dignity, and independence [samostoyatelnost] of each of our countries will continue to facilitate the successful resolution of the difficult tasks that now face them.

T. Mazowiecki reaffirmed his interest in the development of multilateral Soviet-Polish cooperation and in extending its social base. He spoke highly of the policy of perestroyka being implemented in the Soviet Union, which is having a favorable influence on the whole international situation and the development of Polish-Soviet relations.

Now, when for both countries the problem of improvement in the economy and of active involvement in the network of world economic ties has become especially urgent, the Polish Government attaches especial importance to maintaining and developing mutually beneficial Soviet-Polish economic cooperation, to refining its mechanism and improving its efficiency.

An exchange of views took place on interaction in the spheres of culture, science, and human contacts. In this connection M.S. Gorbachev noted that the philosophy of the new thinking which derives from the understanding of interdependence among all peoples of the world and from the priority of values common to all men, opens new prospects for strengthening intellectual links and mutual understanding among broad layers of the Polish and Soviet peoples, and for overcoming the accumulated negative legacy inherited by us from history.

History cannot be remade. But it is possible and necessary to learn lessons from it, to prevent ever returning to that which darkened relations between our peoples in the past, and to carefully preserve and multiply everything valuable that brings them closer together: much, in this respect, depends on the successful development of cooperation among cultural figures and scientists of the two countries and on their joint creative search. This is being fostered, M.S. Gorbachev stressed, among other things, by the policy of perestroyka, democratization, and the renewal of socialism which is currently under way in the USSR.

T. Mazowiecki expressed regret in connection with the actions of extremist forces in Poland that are trying by means of their antics to tarnish Soviet-Polish relations. He spoke out to the effect that the incidents that have occurred are provocative in nature and are contrary to Poland's interests.

With regard to the international situation M.S. Gorbachev and T. Mazowiecki stated that in Europe positive political processes are gaining strength which foster the strengthening of security, growth of trust, and development of international cooperation. However, it is important that the major changes now taking place in East Europe, as well as on the continent as a whole, be organically combined with preservation of the necessary stability, the violation of which could throw Europe far back.

Attempts to consider the dynamic processes on the European continent while wearing blinkers of stereotypes that were formed during the time of the "cold war" are not adequate for these processes. Such an approach,

M.S. Gorbachev noted, is far from being a breakthrough to a new way of thinking, to put it mildly.

Statements by a number of leaders of Western countries who said they have no intentions of using the situation taking shape to attempt to revive political confrontation were positively assessed. At the same time, serious concern was expressed about the revival of revanchist moods that had become apparent in connection with well-known events in the GDR, something which could, if passions of this kind are not cooled, foster encroachments on the postwar borders in Europe. Their inviolability is one of the most important conditions for preserving the common European stability, for continuing the movement toward overcoming the split between East and West, and for creating a new world order consistent with the demands of the times.

The head of the PPR Government confirmed that Poland's loyalty to its obligations as an ally within the Warsaw Pact corresponds to its vital national interests.

They expressed the general understanding that in the interests of stability it is important to develop constructive contacts between the Warsaw Pact and NATO as an integral part of the common European process and construction of the European home in conditions of equilibrium and sufficient security.

The conversation, which was held in a spirit of frankness and mutual amicability, confirmed that the foundations of Soviet-Polish cooperation are firmly rooted in the vital interests of the two states and peoples. M.S. Gorbachev wished success to the Polish broad coalition government and to its leader in solving the complex problems facing friendly Poland.

Says Gorbachev 'Extremely Positive'

LD2411224189 Warsaw PAP in English 2216 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 24—Following his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev at the Kremlin, Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki had this to say in a statement for PAP: "This was a very important meeting, a very direct one. In a talk lasting 1 hour and 45 minutes we discussed all important issues. I above all noted the general secretary's extremely positive attitude to the success of all transformations in Poland. He stated outright that he was interested in us carrying out these changes.

"We spoke about economic matters in our country and the Soviet Union, about international matters. In short, all issues were touched upon in a very good, nice, direct atmosphere."

Referring to Gorbachev's statement for PAP that the relations between both countries and societies constituted a capital which must be multiplied, Premier Mazowiecki added: "Yes, we spoke about this, that this is a capital and that these relations and this alliance are not seasonal and are of a fundamental nature for both sides. This without doubt was affirmed during our meeting and talks."

Ryzhkov Dinner Speech

PM2611150789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of the Two Countries' Peoples"]

[Text] On 24 November in the Great Kremlin Palace a dinner was given on behalf of the Government of the USSR in honor of T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic [PPR].

The officials accompanying him on the visit were present together with him.

N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, Ye.M. Primakov, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, people's deputies of the USSR, the heads of a number of ministries and departments, scientific and cultural figures, and representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church were present on the Soviet side.

N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, made a speech.

The Speech of N.I. Ryzhkov

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, I cordially welcome Tadeusz Mazowiecki, the head of the Government of the Polish People's Republic, who has arrived in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

We are meeting you for the first time, Mr. Chairman, and you are visiting our country for the first time. Of course this is an event that is clearly not typical, as, indeed, much of what is now happening in the world and in this old Europe of ours is not typical. The public of both countries are following this visit intently. After all, in one way or another, it must open a new page in Soviet-Polish relations. And addressing myself to all those who are following this Soviet-Polish meeting and the talks in Moscow, I would like to stress the following:

The Soviet Union attaches paramount importance to goodneighborly relations with the Polish People's Republic; it is true to the fundamental principles of equal rights, respect for sovereignty and nonintervention in each other's internal affairs proclaimed in our joint treaties, and to the principles of freedom of choice and mutually beneficial cooperation. We will continue to attach fundamental importance to strict respect for the territorial and political realities which have been formed in Europe as a result of World War II and postwar developments, including the immutability of the Polish borders. We are for the steadfast development and deepening of cooperation with the PPR in all spheres, both on a bilateral and on a multilateral basis in the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the Council for Mutual

Economic Assistance. Furthermore, I want to say that relations with fraternal Poland are for us not only a question of politics but also a decree of the heart.

Of course, every people has its own fate, its own historical trials, and its own wounds. But if, despite all our differences we have both common joys and common pain, this shows a great deal. This is a true sign of spiritual harmony and the capability of peoples not only to understand one another but to empathize with each other, strive to do good, and to overcome that which still divides us. Without all this, it is difficult to imagine civilized communication between people in our interconnected world.

The USSR makes a suitable assessment of the recent statement of the Polish leaders that Poland continues to strive to develop comprehensive relations with the USSR, basing itself upon everything that unites us and removing from this path everything that obstructs progress. We agree with you, Mr Chairman of the Council of Ministers, that this approach will se the interests of both countries, and the strengthening genuine friendship between our peoples.

During the postwar years, thanks to the efforts of the working people, Poland has become a country with a highly developed production and scientific and technological potential. It has taken an appropriate place in the world community, having gained high internationally prestige as a peace-loving state.

We have sincere respect and the very best feelings toward the Polish people and toward all the veterans and devotees of the great cause of mutual understanding, trust and the brotherhood of our peoples. In speaking of this, I cannot but note the outstanding contribution of Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Polish People's Republic, to strengthening Soviet-Polish relations and to purging them of all that is unnatural and alien that has accumulated in past periods of our history.

The peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland have managed to travel a long and complex road together. There was agreement and mutual misunderstanding, there were periods of drama on that road and there was also the happiness of a joint victory over fascism. The interest of both peoples in one another and their mutual attraction was fed by the spring of popular reason. Thanks to this, the mutual penetration of two cultures and their enrichment of one another did not cease.

The foundations of the friendship and cooperation between our countries were laid by the labor of millions of Soviet people and Poles. It is important that new generations preserve that heritage and increase it.

We are following the efforts of the Polish people to overcome the crisis and ensure stability within the country with great attention and amicability. We sincerely wish you success in improving the economy, solving urgent social probems and strengthening Poland's international position.

We note with satisfaction that the talks held here today reflected a joint aspiration to raise the effectiveness of Soviet-Polish cooperation. The mutual understanding that has been manifested is of great significance when it is taken into account that great efforts are being made in both countries toward solving major economic problems.

To enable bilateral economic ties to develop dynamically and very productively, it is necessary, in our view, to perfect the whole system of economic cooperation in such a way as to ensure mutual advantage and effectiveness of cooperation. This assumes that fuller account will be taken of the realities and demands of the world market. The transfer of economic ties to a balanced and strictly mutually advantageous basis is a natural tendency consistent with world practice. The mutually-complementary nature of the national economy complexes of the Soviet Union and Poland creates favorable conditions for this.

We attach great importance to the coincidence of the positions of the USSR and PPR on the fundamental issues of renewing the mechanism of socialist economic integration in the framework of the Council for Economic Mutual Assistance. We have a common view that well-thought-through radical measures are needed to enable a substantial increase in the effectiveness of multilateral cooperation of the CEMA member-countries, to be secured with due account being taken of the reforms being implemented in these countries and the development of world economic ties.

Our talks have confirmed that both sides have an interest in scientific and cultural links being further developed between the USSR and PPR, in contacts between people being broadened and in our peoples being brought closer together. We perceive in this a long-term factor for strengthening Soviet-Polish relations.

Their current stage is organically linked to the processes of radical reform in the Soviet Union and to the social and political changes in Poland. Major changes are under way in other countries of Eastern Europe as well. Each country, starting from its own internal demands, its specific national characteristics and concrete conditions is itself determining the scale of renewal and the pace of transformation. We are not imposing our recipes for reform on anyone and we respect each people's right to freedom of choice. At the same time, we are convinced of the living force, the vast potential and historic progressive nature of socialism which is taking an a new appearance.

I would particularly like to stress that in the Soviet Union close cooperation with the Polish People's Republic in the international arena and its constructive foreign policy activities are highly thought of. Poland's contribution to universal efforts to lower military confrontation, reduce armaments, and strengthen confidence in central Europe and on the continent as a whole,

to the development of the all-European process, and to settling regional conflicts is most substantial.

Our drive to build a common European home presupposes not only the continent's gradual liberation from the burden of excessive arms but also the ever-wider application of confidence-building measures, the development of cooperation between economic systems, and a deepening of the integration processes in the interests of the prosperity of all European countries.

We see the road to a better future for our continent in the harmony of national interests and those common to all humanity. In building a new socialist model of society at home, the Soviet people are at the same time prepared to take part in the creation of a new and generally acceptable model for civilized relations between the nations of Europe and the whole world.

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted the other day in his message of greeting to the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society, commitment to the cause of mutual respect and of bringing the peoples closer together undoubtedly helps one to confidently orient oneself in today's contradictions, and helps each of our countries to progress. These are eternal humanistic values. They have always, at all times, been shared, defended, and upheld by the best and foremost representatives of Poland and Russia. They will remain in the memories of both fraternal peoples forever.

Let us try to act in such a way that our memories and the lessons of history help us to develop our relations and proceed toward a better future. In conclusion, N.I. Ryzhkov wished T. Mazowiecki and the members of the government fruitful activity, as well as prosperity and progress to all Polish people, and spoke in favor of strengthening mutual understanding, trust, and friendship between the Soviet and Polish peoples.

Mazowiecki Dinner Speech

PM2411233789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of the Two Countries' Peoples"]

[Excerpts] On behalf of the USSR Government, a dinner was given 24 November in the Great Kremlin Palace in honor of T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers.

Present with him were the officials accompanying him on his trip.

Present on the Soviet side were N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, and Ye.M. Primakov; deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR people's deputies; the leaders of a number of ministries and departments; figures from the worlds of science and culture; and representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church.

N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, made a speech. [passage omitted]

Then T. Mazowiecki spoke.

Permit me first of all to express in my own behalf and that of the entire Polish delegation our gratitude for the invitation to pay this visit and for the cordiality shown to us from the very beginning. You are probably aware that hospitality is one of our people's characteristics. That is why we are particularly sensitive to hospitality. So my gratitude stems not from the need to follow the rules laid down for such speeches, but from this particular sensitivity. I sincerely and cordially thank you for this hospitality.

High-sounding phrases are sometimes too easily heard during top-level state visits. However, as for our visit, we all realize the importance and special nature of this time and this event.

Europe is changing, Poland is changing, and the Soviet Union is changing. I am convinced that we are all facing a historic choice—to make our lives more humane and our continent more secure.

I believe that we will cope with that choice.

What has happened in Poland? What are we, as a people, striving for?

For a long time there has been a maturing conviction in Polish society that we should give the institutions of our social life a form corresponding to the people's aspirations: to create a democratic system and restore a Polish economy mired in crisis on the basis of healthy rational principles. After many years of acute internal conflicts, the "roundtable" marked the start of the process of consensus among the main social and political forces in the country. We resolved to rise above our differences in order to solve the task of improving the health of the state.

The people's will was seen in the results of the Sejm and Senate elections. At the initiative of "Solidarity" a coalition government with a broad base in parliament and all society was set up.

We are fully resolved to bring the peaceful, evolutionary process of transformations to its conclusion.

We realize that we will have to overcome great difficulties. The broadest circles and the broadest coalition of political forces acting in our society have united around this task.

For us, it is also extremely important that the international public—above all, Poland's allies and friends—should have a proper understanding of our intentions.

The transformations taking place in our country do not violate Poland's international commitments, and nobody should discern a threat in them. On the contrary,

if they are successful, they will promote stabilization in Europe and strengthen us as a trustworthy and solidary partner.

Our main ally and neighbor—the Soviet Union—is changing at the same time as Poland.

We see the perestroyka you are implementing as an effort aimed not only at improving and modernizing the state but also—and maybe above all—at seeking a model of collective life in which each person's honor and freedom would be observed on an equal footing with the rights of each people and ethnic group.

We realize that the transformations taking place in the Soviet Union are complex and will not be easy.

I want to assure you that we ardently, sincerely, and wholeheartedly wish you success in your efforts.

We wish the Russian people and all the peoples of the Soviet Union success. Being equal to the new times, testing oneself against them, and overcoming not only old dogmas but people's ingrained habits and the inertia of old structures are a sign of wisdom and boldness.

We respect you for undertaking this effort. We respect the Soviet state leadership, and particularly Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for his activities.

We wish you success in perestroyka; we too have a vital interest in it. We are neighbors, we are tied by an alliance and many common interests. That has been the case in the past and will continue to be the case in the future. The processes taking place in our countries influence each other. One of Russia's greatest sons, Alexander Herzen, said that he was for Poland because he was for a free Russia.

If you will permit, Mr Prime Minister, I would say, paraphrasing this expression, that we are today for a Soviet Union which is implementing perestroyka, because we are for Poland.

The alliance uniting our two countries is of fundamental importance for us. This stems from Poland's state interests. Our approach to it is not dictated merely by the prevailing circumstances. On this issue there is a broad consensus enjoying great support in society among different political strands.

Irrespective of which political forces are in power in our country, Poland will fulfill its alliance commitments.

And the best partner for the Soviet Union, a partner which can be relied upon, is a Poland with a political system which suits the majority of its citizens, releases energies and initiative, observes human rights, and supports aspirations for solidarity among the peoples.

I am convinced that equal, reciprocal state interests, rather than ideological interests, should continue to be the basis of the alliance uniting Poland and the Soviet Union.

We also view our alliance in the light of the main principles of Polish foreign policy. These are the Polish state's external and internal sovereignty, the principle of noninterference in other countries' internal affairs, and the peaceful resolution of all disputes.

I believe that the principles of our policy could indeed be of service in overcoming the division of Europe, in furthering the process of restoring its unity, and in opening up its spiritual sources and overall civilizing legacy.

The alliance between Poland and the Soviet Union is a question of immense importance. It operates irrespective of changing circumstances. However, its basis will be even stronger when genuine ties between our peoples are even closer and when there is real friendship between them.

I am convinced that the period we are now experiencing is in every way conducive to a better mutual understanding of our societies and the creation of firm ties between our peoples. We in Poland are experiencing a period of great interest in Russia and the other Soviet peoples, particularly those with which we have historical ties. There is a strong desire among the younger generation of Poles for a closer understanding of and respect for Russian culture. We are aware of the intellectual legacy of the peoples of the Soviet Union. These fine traditions existed even in the hardest times. Today they are helping us again to fully understand each other.

Genuine friendship can only be based on truth and an honest depiction of history. There are many fine pages in history, but there are dark pages too. Among the former are the joint struggle against Hitlerism during World War II. Several hundred thousand Soviet troops advancing on Berlin perished on Polish soil. We will never forget this, just as we will not forget the sufferings your peoples experienced. Graphic proof of the respect with which mankind treats these sufferings was seen in the words of Pope John Paul II during his visit to Oswiecim in 1979, when, out of three memorial plaques, he stopped in front of the plaque devoted to the Russian people.

If we also look at the difficult and painful pages in our joint past, we do so because we want to finally overcome that past. These painful and difficult pages include the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and the deportations and reprisals to which Poles were subjected by the Stalinist apparatus of coercion.

The Katyn atrocity remains a festering wound for Poles.

These difficult and painful pages also include the restrictions on our sovereignty to which we were subjected in the postwar years. Thanks to your state leadership's

positions and to the efforts of the Polish state leadership from the time when you initiated perestroyka, highly substantive changes have come about in this area.

We want to close all these difficult pages of our joint past once and for all, since we are interested not only in the alliance between our countries but also in genuine reconciliation between our peoples—something which is necessary for us, for you, and for the future of Europe and the entire world as a whole, for the future which we are entering together.

I believe that a new page is being turned in our relations. Like millions of my countrymen I would very much like our relations to be as good as possible. The government I head is fully resolved to ensure that this task is fulfilled.

Friendship and cooperation are tested in times of hardship. I am convinced that we will show wisdom and resolve on this path and that we will be wholly trustworthy and reliable allies to each other.

In conclusion, T. Mazowiecki advocated prosperity for the peoples of the Soviet Union, freedom, and solidarity, and he wished N.I. Ryzhkov success.

The speeches by N.I. Ryzhkov and T. Mazowiecki were greeted with applause.

The dinner was held in a friendly atmosphere.

24 Nov Activities Summarized

LD2511014189 Warsaw PAP in English 0007 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 24—Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki began the second day of his official visit to the Soviet Union with laying a wreath at the Unknown Soldier's Tomb in the Alexandrovski Garden adjacent to the Kremlin wall.

Mazowiecki put a wreath of white and red carnations on the tomb. The inscription on ribbons reads: "Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic."

Mazowiecki was briefed on the history of the tomb by Moscow military commander, General Nikolay Smirnov.

The ceremony, watched by a large group of journalists and cameramen, ended with a gala march past.

Plenary Talks

On Friday morning, Polish-Soviet plenary talks began at the Ekaterinovski room of the Kremlin Palace after the welcoming and a brief conversation between Tadeusz Mazowiecki and Nikolay Ryzhkov. Both prime ministers presided over the talks.

Shortly after the end of talks, Polish Government spokeswoman Malgorzata Niezabitowskia briefed PAP reporters on the course of the talks.

Agreement on Cooperation in Environmental Protection

Immediately following plenary talks, a ceremony took place in the Red Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace during which Poland and the Soviet Union signed an intergovernment agreement on cooperation in natural environment protection which is a kind of catalogue of joint conclusions drawn primarily from the Chernobyl catastrophe.

In the afternoon Mikhail Gorbachev received Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki at the Kremlin. Right before the meeting, Gorbachev granted a short interview for PAP.

Niezabitowska's Press Conference

Scores of Polish, Soviet and Western correspondents, including several TV crews, showed up at the Polish Embassy in Moscow for the evening press conference held by Polish Government spokewoman Malgorzata Niezabitowska.

At the outset, Niezabitowska briefed the journalists on Premier Mazowiecki's meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, stating: "A moment ago I talked to the premier who has just ended his meeting with Mr. Gorbachev. Their talk last 1.45 hours. I am thinking about the intensive talks, excluding the customary greeting.

"Premier Mazowiecki is very, very satisfied at this talk. He thinks that the talk was extremely sincere, matter-of-fact, open, friendly, primarily touching upon bilateral issues, Polish-Soviet cooperation. Both sides, both Mr. Gorbachev and Premier Mazowsiecki, stressed the strategic and not seasonal nature of these relations. As concerns Polish matters, they also talked about the economic situation. Many internal problems of both Poland and the Soviet Union were touched upon. Apart from that, the two discussed the German issue, disarmament, the issue of a united Europe, the upcoming meeting with President Bush and Pope John Paul 2, about 'blank spots' and the matter of Katyn.

"As concerns Mr. Gorbachev's attitude towards Poland, Premier Mazowiecki assessed it as very positive, one characterized by very big interest in and very good knowledge of Polish affairs as well as very big understanding of these affairs. This is as much as I have been able to learn a moment ago about this meeting."

Further on, the spokeswoman presented detailed information about Friday's, Polish-Soviet plenary talks. Niezabitowska said: "They began with the address of Premier Ryzhkov who congratulated Premier Mazowiecki on his appointment to the post. Premier Ryzhkov stated that he very well understood how difficult and responsible the role of the Polish Government is in such a difficult economic situation and wished it success. He next expressed a readiness to discuss all matters on the level of premiers, in the general, strategic sense, and in detail at the level of respective ministers. He expressed a hope that relations between Poland and the Soviet Union would preserve those values which were worked out in

previous decades and that they would further develop on the basis of sovereignty, good-neighbourly relations and mutual respect. He stressed that the Soviet side held the Polish nation and state in high esteem. Premier Ryzhkov thought that we have conditions for a positive process of developing good relations between our countries to continue.

"Premier Mazowiecki thanked for the invitation and hospitality and invited Premier Ryzhkov to pay a visit to Poland. He stated that his current visit was an unconventional visit because this was a trip made by a non-communist premier. At the same time Premier Mazowiecki stressed that both he and all other ministers who were in the opposition before, as well as the whole government of a broad coalition, attach great importance to Polish-Soviet relations, to an alliance between our countries. And as the premier had earlier stated in his expose, Poland would meet all commitments stemming from international law."

Spokeswoman Niezabitowska went on to say: "During discussions on economic matters, attended by both premiers, the head of the Polish Central Planning Office Osiatynski, Polish Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Swiecicki and Soviet Foreign Economic Relations Minister Katushev, the sides agreed that the structure of cooperation had to be changed because it did not correspond to changes carried out in both the Soviet Union and Poland. The changes are to head in the direction of decentralization so that trade and economic relations not be run by governments but by independent economic subjects which would make decisions on their own.

"As concerns prices, they should be based on world prices, while the choice of currency in transactions would be freely selected by the economic subjects mentioned above. The governments would chart out strategic directions and long-term agreements. Supplies of some commodities should have government guarantees. Probably in 1990, a certain group of enterprises, perhaps 10-15 percent of those cooperating, would start applying these new principles on an experimental basis.

"The Polish side stressed that we are very keen on maintaining—in line with the arrangements from last year—supplies of fuels and raw materials in coming years at a level not smaller than in the current five-year period. In the case of gas, under the 'Yamburg Agreement' we would like supplies of it to increase significantly. Premier Ryzhkov stated that the Soviet side has a deep will of meeting its obligations.

"The sides also touched upon the issue of an agreement on social insurance. Work on this agreement is very advanced but somehow it could not be signed so far. Now both sides agreed that one must conclude it very quickly."

Spokeswoman Niezabitowska went on to say: "The second group of issues touched upon by the Polish side concerned the Polish community in the Soviet Union. As Premier Mazowiecki stressed, this matter is very important for us. We are very happy that the situation of this group of the population has of late undergone big, positive changes. Ten Polish socio-cultural associations have been set up, new Polish schools have also been opened but there is still much to be done. The premier mentioned several issues. One is a proposal that Soviet citizens of Polish descent be able to travel to Poland without invitations.

"Another matter is teaching Polish in Soviet schools situated in large Polish communities. This includes the possibility of sending Polish teachers for temporary stay in the USSR. Furthermore, we seek consent for Polish priests to arrive for pastoral service. And last but not least, there is the issue of circulating Polish periodicals and emitting Polish TV programs to Soviet republics bordering on Poland.

"Premier Ryzhkov took a kind and positive stand on these postulates.

"Returning to plenary talks: the sides touched upon several incidents which have taken place in Poland of late, such as the removal of the monument to Dzieerzynski and attempts to burn Lenin's monument in Nowa Huta, as well as acts of profanation of the graves of Soviet soldiers. Premier Mazowiecki once again expressed deep sorrow at these events but also asked the Soviet Government and political leadership of the USSR, as well as Soviet society, to view this in the right proportions. These were sad incidents, painful but marginal ones. We will try to prevent them from happening. We condemn them and very firmly at that but it would be very bad were these incidents to distort Poland's image. As never before there is understanding and sympathy in Poland for what is taking place in the Soviet Union and for your country, Premier Mazowiecki said."

Premier Ryzhkov stated that he thought that neither the political leadership, nor the government, nor the nation generalize Poland's image through these incidents which although are sometimes painful and capable of poisoning the atmosphere, are perceived as pertaining to certain small groups only. In this respect Premier Mazowiecki stated that these small groups also frequently act against him. One should surely perceive the attempt to burn Lenin's statue in Nowa Huta on the eve of the visit to the Soviet Union in this way.

Summing up the talks, Prime Minister Ryzhkov found them exceptionally beneficial and matter-of-fact, Niezabitowska stated.

Asked whether the issue of compensation for forced labour during Stalinist times was discussed, Niezabitowska replied in the affirmative and said that this matter remained open. Premier Ryzhkov handled it by assessing that it should be separated from the issue of pension and disability payments.

In the evening, the Soviet side gave a reception at the Kremlin in the Polish premier's honour. The premiers of Poland and the USSR delivered toasts.

Meets With Soviet Poles

LD2511172389 Warsaw PAP in English 1557 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 25—Poland's Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki held a two-hour meeting with Poles living in the Soviet Union, at the Polish Embassy here today.

Tadeusz Mazowiecki stressed that much has had to change in Poland and in the Soviet Union to make such a meeting possible.

You can play a significant role as a natural bridge between Poland and the Soviet Union, said the Polish premier while presenting the assumptions of the new policy of the Polish Government towards Polonia in the neighbouring countries.

Holds News Conference 25 Nov

LD2511211989 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1414 GMT 25 Nov 89

[News conference by Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki, accompanied by Polish Industry Minister Tadeusz Syryjczyk, Foreign Economic Relations Minister Marcin Swiecicki, and chief of the Central Planning Office Jerzy Osiatynski, at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press center on 25 November in Moscow—live]

[Text] [Mazowiecki] Ladies and gentlemen, I give you my sincerest greetings. I am glad that (?you) have come in such large numbers, despite the fact that it is Saturday. I apologize to your families for breaking up your free time. I would like to make a brief statement. As you know, ladies and gentlemen, this visit was not a conventional visit; it was not a conventional visit for those of us who came here nor for our hosts. As for me, this is my first visit to Moscow, on a visit such as this. As you understand, this cannot have been easy for me. I know of the great Russian culture, art, literature. I am interested in it, although undoubtedly only to a very small degree compared to my friend Andrzej Drawicz' interest. But this is the first time I have encountered Russian reality, Soviet reality, Moscow. And these impressions of mine are impressions that are very positive.

I liked it more here than I thought I would. This meeting, as I have already said, was an unconventional meeting, is an unconventional meeting. This is only one half, but in a political sense the most important half. This was a particularly unusual meeting; because I came as a prime minister of a government based on new principles. I think that we have reached understanding with my main interlocutors about the fact that my government, which arose out of Solidarity and is based on wide-ranging coalition, wants to strengthen and develop Polish-Soviet relations, treating these relations as the principal element of its policy. We have been met with an understanding of this new situation and recognition. Our talks took place in a frank and sincere climate, which was also matter of fact. Yesterday's meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev was of a special character. He demonstrated great understanding of our needs. Also, the meeting with Prime Minister Ryzhkov was of great significance to us and demonstrated understanding.

I, and our whole delegation are very grateful to our hosts for their hospitality.

We know that in the Soviet Union a wide public opinion exists, and that is why I am still pleased; I am pleased that I will have the chance to meet with people of culture and science, both today in Moscow and on Monday in Leningrad. For understandable reasons, the meeting in the Polish Embassy with Polonia [Poles living abroad] representativews held great significance for us; they live in various regions of the Soviet Union. The fact that this Polonia has begun to organize and that we met with them also illustrates the great changes in this respect. The problems brought up in these meetings were numerous; I think that in all of these we have made some wider progress.

So much to start with. I am open to your questions.

[Vremya reporter] Vladimir [surname indistinct], from the "Vremya" program. I have two questions for the prime minister. The first is: What significance do you attach to the alliance between the Soviet Union and Poland and also in the framework of the Warsaw Pact, to assuring the security and territorial integrity of Poland? That was the first question. The second question is: Before coming to Moscow, in an interview for (?Muscovites), you said that [passage indistinct]. Do you hold an identical stance, that you represent the government and not the party?

[Mazowiecki] Yes, yes. Already in my first Sejm speech, I said that the government which I head would respect all treaties and alliances, especially those that ensue from Poland's adherance to the Warsaw Pact. I can confirm this.

Simultaneously, as you know, the entire Warsaw Pact is ever more speaking of and moving toward an ever greater emphasis on its political and not its military character. I stressed here in the talks, and I would like to stress it here at this conference as well, that irrespective of Poland's adherance to the Warsaw Pact, bilateral relations between Poland and the Soviet Union are of important significance for us. And we want both sides to have an understanding of the significance of these relations and of the fact that—as I have already stated—we regard them as being independent of short-term considerations. I think that both this more general aspect of the Warsaw Pact and the bilateral relations between Poland and the Soviet Union are of importance for the shape of relations within Europe, for the stability of these relations. As for us, we attach and we will continue to attach

great weight to them, and this weight will be no less than was the case with our previous governments. At the same time, we hope that we will perhaps make this stance socially more broad-based in the new conditions.

As for your second question, I emphasize that it is the balance of forces rather than the intraparty balance of forces that is of importance as far as the state is concerned. This is because this is precisely what is new in our relations. I do not dispute either the right of the communist parties of Poland and the Soviet Union to have relations or the significance of these relations. However, at present it is the state dimension of these relations that is of fundamental significance for the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union. That is why I emphasize it.

Possibly contained within your question is another subquestion: Am I, as far as internal matters are concerned, such a pure, nonparty person, or do I represent a certain political trend? Of course, I am linked with Solidarity as a social and political movement. I make no secret of that. But simultaneously, taking on the post of prime minister, I said that I wanted to be the prime minister of a government of all Poles. And I try to behave in such a way, but of course keeping my views as well, my colors and tones.

[(?PRENSA) correspondent] (?PRENSA) [word indistinct], Italy. Mr Prime Minister, regarding the meeting with the Soviet leaders in which you touched on the problem of the western borders. Did you (?sign) or receive some guarantee from the Soviet leadership regarding the borders? Thank you.

[Mazowiecki] I did not raise such questions, as such questions do not exist. The western borders of Poland exist and there is no issue and, in particular, there is no issue between us and the Soviet Union on this matter.

On the other hand, we of course spoke of an issue that is much discussed throughout the world recently, about the events in the GDR, about the discussions about the so-called German question. And as for this too, there is, of course, no doubt that in this respect, too, there is not and there cannot be any issue of borders. In any case, as you know, I recently signed a statement jointly with Chancellor Kohl during his visit to Warsaw, and in this statement, too, it is clearly stated that the sides signing this statement feel that respect for the borders extant today in Europe is a condition for peace and stability in Europe.

[Ostrowski] Marek Ostrowski, PAP, Warsaw. Mr Prime Minister, in your toast at the Kremlin you stressed the desire and need to finally overcome the past in the relations with the Soviet Union. Did you sense in your talks with Mikhail Gorbachev and others that the Soviet Union is showing the same desire?

And a second question, if I may. In a few days, the secretary general is going on a visit to the Vatican. Yesterday, we heard at the press conference that the matter of this visit was mentioned. Can you say a bit more on this subject? Thank you.

[Mazowiecki] As regards the past, of course the matter of difficult and painful matters of a mutual past were mentioned in these talks. There is a mutual understanding that the field should be cleared in this respect. There is a will to do this. There is, of course, the matter which is most painful to us—and we are expecting to clear this up—that is the issue of the Katyn crime. We expect the rapid clearing up of this issue; and this expectation of ours was expressed in these talks. I met with understanding on the importance of this matter to us and to clearing up the relations between our societies and nations. My interlocutors, and Mikhail Gorbachev in particular, are aware of the significance of this issue to us and we expect that this matter will be cleared up at last.

And the second question was, ah yes, the second question was about the visit to the Vatican. Well, I'll say openly I told Mikhail Gorbachev that he will soon meet one great Pole. And we spoke of this, about the moral significance of the meeting with the Pope. And earlier, a little while ago as you know, I was in Rome and was at the Pope's [words indistinct] a representative of the Vatican was here in Moscow and discussed the timetable of the meeting. So, I spoke within a short period with both men, and I can say that both are thinking of this meeting with great interest, and I think that we are all (?expecting) a meeting of great moral eloquence.

[Unidentified reporter] [Words indistinct] Mr Prime Minister, from what I know, you did not succeed in fulfulling one point in your program: visiting Moscow. What was the cause for the extension of the round of talks today? That is the first question. Now, I have a second question, but I just don't know for whom. I address it to the prime minister, in association with this: Was the issue of reparations for the forced labor of Poles during the war raised? Was any of this matter discussed; were decisions made about which we could inform our countrymen? And on economic matters, how did the talks go? Can we also inform our readers about the details, and, and...

[Mazowiecki, interrupting] This is not a question, this is altogether...

[Reporter, interrupting] Have any concrete decisions been made on importing fuels?

[Mazowiecki] As for the first question, I do not know [words indistinct]. I did not have much time to sightsee in Moscow, but yesterday I walked down the Arbat and smelled (?Moscow restaurants). This regards the first question.

Regarding the second question, these matters were dealt with earlier by our foreign minister. We dealt here with the issue of an agreement on social security, which perhaps has some common ground with the subject in question. We will continue work in this sphere.

Regarding the third question, principally the deliveries will be maintained at the same level as now. We, of course, are speaking about deliveries of raw materials. We of course have submitted the request to increase the deliveries. But you understand that it is difficult to expect these matters to be resolved in a 1-2-day period.

[TIME reporter, in English] Two questions please, from TIME magazine. Is it possible to ask in English?

[Unidentified speaker] We prefer Russian. [passage indistinct]

[TIME correspondent] When you were in detention in 1981, did it ever occur to you that you would visit the Soviet Union as prime minister of Poland and, even further, would have such a friendly discussion with Brezhnev's successor, as the one you had in the Kremlin yesterday?

[Mazowiecki] My brief answer is no, I did not. [laughter]

[TIME Reporter] Yesterday you discussed the so-called issue of German revanchism with the general secretary. What kind of mutual understanding did you come to on this question? Are you concerned at the possibility of a united Germany, and if so why?

[Mazowiecki] As you know, or may not know, the Polish position on this matter was expressed earlier. It contains the following elements: We recognize the right of all nations to self-determination. We believe the German issue only can be resolved, can only be seen, as a European issue. Our position, finally, is that this problem falls within the scope of the superpowers. We have already expressed this view before. During our conversation yesterday, we stated that the reunification problem currently is not on the agenda as far as the present time is concerned. We stated that we welcomed the democratic changes in the GDR. At the same time, the reunification problem is not a problem for today. We also stated that the stability in and security of Europe must be respected. As far as this is concerned, we were completely unanimous. Here there are no differences. We think that, in actual fact, numerous European countries, countries of Western Europe, think the same, irrespective of whether this is publicly voiced or not. Poland, however, is especially in a situation in which it must act with clarity and precision on this question, which concerns Europe's stability and the security of its own borders.

[IL MESSAGERO reporter, in English] [Name indistinct]. Two short questions for the prime minister. The first one, which is connected to the question we were just discusssing now, about the reunification of Germany. You spoke about the special responsibility of the superpowers. Would you be in favor of a common declaration of the four allied powers about the postwar borders in Europe?

[Mazowiecki] What can I say in reply to this question? I would not mind it at all if the four superpowers confirmed that these borders are inviolable and that the stability of borders is of fundamental significance as far as Europe is concerned.

[IL MESSAGERO reporter] Thank you. The second question is this: Yesterday you were in a restaurant called Prague, but what are you thinking about the situation in Prague now? [laughter]

[Mazowiecki] Well, as you can see, it was only yesterday that I visited the Prague Restaurant and the consequences of that are already at hand! [laughter] But this is just a joke on my part. I think that everywhere it is important to develop things toward democracy, human rights, respect for the will of the people. I think that the situation in various countries is developing in this direction. I hope that this is also the case as far as Czechoslovakia is concerned. But, naturally, I neither intend nor wish to interfere in these internal matters of theirs. This is because my views are no longer those of a private person but those of a prime minister of government. Allow me to dwell on this a bit.

[TYGODNIK POWSZECHNY reporter] My question follows on from this. Did problems in other Warsaw Pact states figure in the talks with Mikhail Gorbachev? The second question pertains to the issues between Poland and the Soviet Union. During your meeting with Polish expatriates today you said, Mr. Prime Minster, that two particularly important problems from among the group of ethnic problems in the Soviet Union were raised: the issue of Polish language instruction and the issue of providing for people's religious needs. Have specific accords been reached as far as both these issues are concerned?

[Mazowiecki] As far as the first issue is concerned, when one speaks of the situation in Europe one cannot now regard the transforamtions underway in Central Europe in isolation from the changes and events taking place in other countries. So, in this sense, these problems did indeed figure, but in no way was interference in this situation contemplated.

As far as the second issue is concerned—the question of teaching and of providing for people's religious needs—we touched upon these issues during the plenary talks with Prime Minister Ryzhkov and they were touched upon during the talks between Polish ministers and their Soviet counterparts. The first issue—that of teaching—was touched upon during the conversation Minister Hall had with the Soviet chairman of the State Committee for Public Education. The point here revolves around the Polish language and involves visits by Polish language teachers. As for providing for people's religious needs—that Polish priests be able to come here on visits—we presented this postulate to Prime Minister Ryzhkov and it will be examined. We will yet return to this issue. In any case, the postulate was not rejected out of hand, it

was received with understanding and will, in all probability, figure in our future talks with the head of the local—I do not know what you call it—Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers. What I do not know is is this: Will we be able to do this on this occasion? In any case, the matter has gotten off the ground.

[Smolar] Eugeniusz Smolar, BBC Polish section. First, are you perhaps intending to go to the "Bucharest" Restaurant tonight? [laughter] And the second question...

[Mazowiecki; interrupting] Is there a Polish restaurant?

[Smolar] And the second question: Soviet armies are stationed on Polish territory which, in the conviction of at least a part of public opinion, do not have a solely educational role to play; and not necessarily a military one, but potentially a police role. Was the matter of the stationing of Soviet armies in Poland a topic of discussion in the course of your talks or plenary talks?

[Mazowiecki] I don't know whether that is indeed the opinion as to this police role. Various armies are stationed in Europe. This is the result of the division of Europe and the world. The status of armies, at least in Poland, has been regulated since 1956. And we did not speak of these matters. On the other hand, we touched on certain financial matters and ones associated with that and decided to examine them bilaterally.

[AP reporter, in English] ASSOCIATED PRESS. Sir, this evening you are going to meet with members of the independent intellectual community in Moscow. Can you tell us what you would like to tell them and what kinds of questions you would like to ask them?

[Mazowiecki] I am simply very curious about this meeting. It is with interest that I await this encounter with the Soviet Union's live and interesting public. I will tell you sincerely that I do not have any specific questions in mind. I think that they too, can put some questions to me. I simply wanted us to make each other's acquaintance. I want to ask them how they appraise the situation, the development of perestroyka in the Soviet Union. I also think that they will ask me various questions about Poland, too. I am very interested in this meeting, as, indeed, in all other meetings in Moscow and in the Soviet Union; they are really of interest to me.

[Unidentified reporter] The conference of a conservative council on the question of Eastern Europe was held in Warsaw in October. Representatives of certain revanchist associations of expellees based in Germany took part in it. What is the Polish Government's attitude to this meeting, to this conference? Mr. Prime Minister, what is your attitude toward the demands that surface now and then in Germany in connection with the question of the German minority in Poland?

[Mazowiecki] I will give you a more extensive reply to your second question. As for the first question, let me tell you I attach no importance to this conference. As for the second question, this is what things look like. Up until recently, an official doctrine was prevalent in our country to the effect that Poland has no national minorities at all. The doctrine proclaimed that following World War II, we became a state in which one nation lived and one nation alone and that there is no problem of minorities at all. This, however, is just one side of the coin. We have now considered [words indistinct] and that, although, they do not constitute a great problem numerically, nevertheless, one should not shut one's eyes to the fact that they exist. This also concerns the existence of people who consider themselves part of the German culture, language, and descent. The other side of the coin is to see all this in correct proportions. This particularly applies to the question of the German minority.

Whoever is more closely acquainted with nationalities, or minorities issues in Poland and Polish history knows how complex these problems are in Silesia. That is why we must watch them carefully. We had a phenomenon of emigration to the FRG by people who began to acknowledge their German roots even though earlier they did not think that way. This is simply the result of the different standards of living. That is why, considering that people of German origin do exist, and they could even be called a German minority, we have said to our partners in the FRG—for instance Chancellor Kohl—that we will respect the rights of these people. But they must understand that we will counteract most decisively and resolutely the artificial expansion of this problem and taking advantage of the situation in the different standards of living. We have explained to our interlocutors how this complex problem is important to us; and while promising to respect these rights which truly are the minority rights, we will do what we can so that this problem is not blown up artificially. This is because it could split us and give rise to very unfavorable and dangerous tendencies.

[Unidentified reporter, in English] You said you'd like to follow up on my question earlier. We appreciate the prime minister's humor in saying he did not expect to be here as prime minister. In addition to being a political development, it is also a great human drama. Could you tell us a bit about your feelings about being here as prime minister after having been a major figure in Solidarity when it was outlawed?

[Mazowiecki] You know, this is not just a question for me. The roles of many people in Poland have changed. I mean the roles of people who used to be in opposition and now are members of parliament, let's say—their role has changed, too. And, after all, I express the view that actually all political forces in Poland must, as it were, rethink their role and find their role to play. But I do understand that the most vivid manifestation of this is embodied in my person. It is precisely because of the fact that I am the prime minister. As a human being, so to speak, I feel I stand for the same values. Naturally, I do that in a new role and I have different problems and a different scale of responsibilities. But, from the moral viewpoint, this responsibility, properly speaking,

remains the same. But I do feel I stand for the implementation of the self-same values. If I had not had this feeling, I would never have taken up this role.

[Piasecki] Jerzy Piasecki, TRYBUNA LUDU. Mr. Prime Minister, what, in your view, is the biggest success of your visit to Moscow? In your estimation, what is the biggest success of this visit?

[Mazowiecki] I think that the most important task I set myself was to reach a mutual understanding here. I cannot answer for my collocutors. However, I did get the impression that we reached a mutual understanding. And I think that—if I can go back to the start of this news conference and if I can mention the fact that this visit was unconventional—I think that this mutual understanding is something very important and, perhaps, the most important thing as far as this visit is concerned. [applause]

'Common Language' Found in Talks

LD2511172989 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki described his official visit to the Soviet Union as "special".

Speaking before reporters here on Saturday, Mazowiecki said his visit was special because he was visiting the Soviet Union as a prime minister of a government based on new principles.

"I believe that my major interlocutors and I understood each other, and found common language as regards the fact that my government created on the initiative of Solidarity and based on a broad coalition, wants to develop and expand Polish-Soviet relations. The principles of our policy were regarded with understanding," he said.

Mazowiecki said the talks were held in a businesslike, frank and benevolent atmosphere.

"Yesterday's meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev had a special climate. Gorbachev seemed to be well aware of our needs. Our meeting with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov was also very important. He showed understanding," he said.

A diverse range of issues was discussed during the talks and there was some movement forward in all directions, the prime minister said.

Mazowiecki said that he has a good background in Russian culture, art and literature, but was visiting Moscow and the Soviet Union for the first time.

He said his overall impression was positive and that he liked his stay in Moscow more than he had anticipated.

Mazowiecki thanked his hosts for their hospitality.

Talks 'Businesslike, Frank'

LD2511191189 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki described his official visit to the Soviet Union as "special".

Speaking before reporters here on Saturday Mazowiecki said that understanding reached during talks with Soviet leaders was the major outcome of his visit to Moscow.

Mazowiecki said the talks were held in a businesslike, frank and benevolent atmosphere.

"Yesterday's meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev had a special climate. Gorbachev seemed to be well aware of our needs. Our meeting with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov was also very important for us," he said.

A diverse range of issues was discussed during the talks and there was some movement forward in all directions, the prime minister said.

He wouldn't deny the importance of relations between the communist parties of the two countries, saying at the same time that a state dimension has now advanced to the forefront of Soviet- Polish relations.

He pointed that his government will comply with all accords and commitments which stem from Poland's membership in the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The sides did not discuss the stationing of Soviet troops on Polish territory. The status of the Soviet military presence was regulated in 1956.

The sides however, discussed certain financial issues connected with the troops' presence and decided to jointly study the situation.

Mazowiecki said that touchy issues in Soviet-Polish history were also raised during the talks.

He elaborated on the shooting of Polish servicemen in Katyn during the Second World War.

"We expect this issue to be lifted very soon. I came across an understanding of the importance this issue has for us and for the 'clearing up' of relations between our peoples and societies," Mazowiecki said.

Commenting on the Polish position over "the German question," Mazowiecki said Poland acknowledges the right of every nation to self-determination.

Poland believes this is a European question which shall be also taken up by the superpowers, he said.

He said the four nations could sign a document which will reiterate the inviolability of the European borders.

Mazowiecki hailed democratic reforms in the German Democratic Republic, saying that German reunification was not an issue for today.

This process shall be based on stability and security in Europe, and Polish and Soviet participants in the talks were unanimous about this, he said.

Poland will oppose attempts to fan the issue of Poles of German descent, the premier said. Speculation on national feelings and interests of the German minority threatens to split Polish society.

The talks also focused on changes in Central Europe, Mazowiecki said, stressing that the discussions had no aim to interfere in the developments in the area.

Confirms Polish Role in Warsaw Pact

LD2611220789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Nov 89

[From the "Seven Days" program, introduced by Eduard Sagalayev; interview with Polish Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki by Vsevolod Solovyev; date, place not given; Mazowiecki speaks in Polish with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Sagalayev] You have to agree that the visit of a foreign head of government to Moscow is, all in all, a habitual event. But the visit to our country by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, is a special event. For the first time in decades a nonparty Polish prime minister has visited the Soviet Union. More than that, a figure of Solidarity. Tadeusz Mazowiecki has given an interview for the Seven Days program.

[Solovyev] Mr. Mazowiecki, you are a prominent figure in Solidarity. Our country's stand toward Solidarity was, until recently, unequivocal. Has this hampered you at the talks in Moscow?

[Mazowiecki] No, this has not hampered me at all. And I did not get the impression that the people I spoke to were hampered by it either.

[Solovyev] Prime minister, what, in your view, should be left unchanged and what should be altered in relations between our countries?

[Mazowiecki] History needs to be cleansed so that it does not hamper us either now or in the future. This is a matter of very great significance. This is a moral issue and also one that has its political consequences. And this is the fundamental issue. Apart from this, we must understand each other very well, that we are essential to each other and essential always.

[Solovyev] I would like to ask you about the so-called blank spots. They exist in the history of any state, whether they be many or few. How do you appraise the work of the joint Soviet-Polish commission of historians. Does the public not impede its work through its emotions?

[Mazowiecki] I do not think that public emotions have impeded the work of those commissions that have now been working for quite some time. It is essential that this work is completed and that these issues are elucidated.

[Solovyev] Allowance is increasingly being made in the West for the possibility of a withdrawal—indeed people are even speaking of the inevitable withdrawal—of Poland from the Warsaw Pact. Your view is known—that Poland is and will remain a member of the Warsaw Pact. But how would you respond to the claim being increasingly heard from the West?

[Mazowiecki] I have not heard serious-minded politicians speaking about the withdrawal of Poland from the Warsaw Pact, or making any calculations on the basis of this. Perhaps people in less serious circles are speaking about this, but I have not come across this among serious-minded politicians. At the same time, both in the West and the East, people are talking about the prospect of there being no blocs at all. I think that we must strive toward this, but for the meantime, while the blocs exist, Poland's place is where it is.

[Solovyev] Prime minister, can one speak today about Poles' unanimous support for your government as, say, it was in June, during the elections?

[Mazowiecki] I believe that the support is great and significant that it is the kind of support that no government has had, at any time, during the postwar history of Poland. But this government now has serious matters to deal with and therefore there may be some fluctuation in this support. Difficulties may begin to show, and this needs to be looked at realistically. But I think that this support will be maintained, and it is the basis of the stability of those decisions we are now making in Poland.

[Solovyev] What is the role of Walesa today?

[Mazowiecki] The role of Lech Walesa is still great. His opinions, his voice, is a voice that everyone listens to. He is, undoubtedly, the leader of Solidarity, a person of nationwide importance. And I believe that this role will be maintained.

[Solovyev] Prime minister. What question would you like to hear from me?

[Mazowiecki] For you to ask me a question, or for me to ask you a question?

[Solovyev] No.

[Mazowiecki] Perhaps I could ask you a question: How do you see me, as a prime minister who is visiting from neighboring Poland and who is not a communist? Do you see me as a weirdo or as a normal partner?

[Solovyev] Only, and unequivocally, as a normal person and as a partner.

[Mazowiecki] That means that my visit has been successful. [both men laugh]

Lays Wreath at Katyn Memorial

LD2611210989 Moscow TASS in English 2016 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Smolensk November 26 TASS—Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, visited the hero-city Smolensk today.

The guest familiarised himself with historic and architectural sights of the olden Russian city.

Mazowiecki and persons accompanying him visited the Katyn Forest, the burial place of Polish officers and Soviet servicemen who fell in the years of the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945). The distinguished guest placed wreaths at the memorial.

Visits Zagorsk Monastery

LD2611221189 Warsaw PAP in English 2135 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 26—Zagorsk, some 70 kilometres to the northeast of Moscow, means the same for the Orthodox Church and Russia what Czestochowa does for Poles and Poland.

Poland's governmental delegation headed by Tadeusz Mazowiecki visited Zagorsk in the morning today.

Archimandrite Fyeogmost greeted the premier at the gate of the Troitskiy Monastery.

"At that Russia's sacred place we wish you inspiration from the saints we worship", the archimandrite addressed Premier Mazowiecki. "We are particularly pleased to host you, the head of government of a befriended country which Poland is. We have a rich history of mutual relations. And although it is not univocal, it does tend towards improvement. We believe in that and we pray for that."

Archimandrite Fyeogmost wished Premier Mazowiecki success in his difficult work and God's blessing for the Polish nation. "We will pray," he said, "for peace and mutual understanding between all.

Tadeusz Mzowiecki and his entourage toured the monastery. They also visited the Orthodox Church just when the priest was directing the sign of peace to the congregation during a mass.

The Polish prime minister toured a museum featuring a collection of the greatest treasures of the Orthodox Church and its culture.

Mazowiecki met with students of the theological academy and seminary. "I have come here as a head of government to reaffirm and inspire further friendship and alliance between our states. I have come here also as a Pole and believer," he said, addressing the meeting.

Representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church stated that they particularly value the visit by the Polish premier since, as they put it, they meet with someone who understands spiritual things and needs.

Seen Off for Leningrad by Ryzhkov

LD2711072489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, has left Moscow for Leningrad today. He was seen off at Vnukovo Airport by Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Ties With Poland, Mazowiecki Visit Viewed

PM2411120389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[V. Runov report: "Without 'Blank Spots'"]

[Text] Warsaw—The first foreign visit made by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, was to the Vatican, where he had a meeting with Pope John Paul II, a Pole by birth, who is a longstanding patron of "Solidarity." His second trip abroad will be to the Soviet Union. This is only his second visit in over 2 months. It is not surprising: The country is still in a difficult economic situation, which could develop into widespread popular unrest at any moment. This is how your TASS correspondent in Poland begins his article prepared specially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

The new government has adopted a large number of important decisions, and a broad program of economic reforms is still going ahead. However, there have still been no tangible positive results. Prices are still rising. In comparison with July, the prices of basic foodstuffs rose by 187 percent in August and by 57 percent in September; last month inflation was so high that there was a noticeable drop in the consumption of foodstuffs. Prices fell slightly as a result of this. Specialists believe that this kind of growth in prices accompanied by a constant rise in wages will set the level of inflation at approximately 900 percent this year. Despite this, the sociopolitical situation in the country is still relatively calm at present. In order to understand the processes taking place in the country, we must try to sum up past events.

So, after having undivided rule of the country for 44 years, the communists were forced to cede power to "Solidarity" as a result of the parliamentary elections held in June this year.

The elections, which developed into a national plebiscite, showed that the Polish United Workers' Party [PZPR] is unpopular in society. The political and economic results of the entire period of people's power are consequently being questioned. This is confirmed, in particular, by the results of a sociological survey conducted at the end of October by the public opinion

research center attached to the Radio and Television Committee. Answering a question about their attitude to certain social institutions and organizations, 87 percent of the respondents expressed faith in the Catholic church, 68 percent in the government, and only 11 percent in the PZPR.

The Council of Ministers has very vigorously set about transforming economic structures and is conducting active foreign policy work with the aim of securing economic assistance from the West. The new authorities are making substantial concessions to their Western partners. This was most clearly apparent during the recent visit to Poland by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl. In particular, the Poles consented to guardianship of the graves of German soldiers who died on Polish territory, an accord was reached on restoring the German names of Polish population centers in legal documents and postal correspondence, and the rights of the German minority will now be recognized, which Poland would not agree to in the past. The FRG has pledged to give government guarantees for credit aid to Poland amounting to DM3 billion. And it was recently announced that the U.S. Senate has approved the final version of aid to Poland, which amounts to $857 million.

However, the new authorities have certainly not forgotten that the Soviet Union is Poland's main trade partner. The USSR annually supplies this country with some 15 million tonnes of oil, 7.9 billion cubic meters of gas, 11.5 million tonnes of iron ore, and a large quantity of machine tools, machinery, and equipment. Cooperation has brought mutual benefits for decades.

However, a fairly strong desire to rewrite many pages in our common history has appeared recently among certain circles. Today any student talking about the history of his state's formation will tell you with total certainty that in July 1944 in addition to liberating the country from fascism, the Red Army brought the Poles the system which led the country into an impasse, while the tactful member of the intelligentsia, trying to sweeten the pill, will add that the responsibility for this rests with Stalin rather than the Soviet people.

This formulation of the problem sheds light on the instances of anti-Sovietism which have recently become more frequent in Poland.

Of course, the layers of problems that have built up over the decades cannot possibly be resolved in a short space of time, but we cannot allow the "blank spots" in Soviet-Polish relations to moulder and grow yellow. The years are passing and the dearth of information is being filled with half-truths and often even blatant lies. This is possibly the reason why a young "Solidarity" member who, by virtue of his tender years, has only recently become involved in political life, suddenly announced to the whole country on Polish television a few days ago that Soviet communists aspire to world domination and that the only reason they cannot attain this goal is the extreme economic backwardness of their country. You get rather a sinister feeling from this kind of pluralism of opinions, which is a mixture of ignorance and blind hostility.

Probably many Poles as well as myself were saddened by the television report broadcast several days ago on the destruction of the memorial to F.E. Dzerzhinskiy which stood in the center of Warsaw. It was a very simple operation: It was hooked up to a crane and thrown to the ground. Laughing hysterically, the crowd simply broke up the pedestal with their bare hands, frenziedly smashing each granite slab on the roadway. We have seen this kind of thing elsewhere in the past....

It would be wrong to overemphasize facts of this kind, but they also cannot be ignored, because they are part of our relationship. Only the truth and real results of cooperation will help eradicate them. That is the only way to dispel the myths about our country.

Some optimism is inspired by the fact that the new government, which took up office just 2 months ago, has already stated very clearly how it intends to build relations with our country. In September this year L. Balcerowicz, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, said that the Polish side, which imports a large quantity of fuel and raw materials from the Soviet Union, is interested in strengthening contacts with the Soviet Union. Neighbors need and indeed are bound to trade between themselves, but the present system of transactions leaves a very great deal to be desired. L. Balcerowicz stressed that the Polish side intends to base its relations with the Soviet Union on purely commercial principles.

At the moment society rates the government fairly highly. According to sociological research, 11 percent of the respondents said the Council of Ministers works well, 62 percent that it works well on the whole, 18 percent had no opinion on this, and only 7 percent gave T. Mazowiecki a "low mark." But the premier himself is seriously concerned by the hardships the approaching winter will bring. Specialists have predicted that if it is a hard winter, many large industrial enterprises may grind to a halt because of a shortage of fuel.

As winter approaches, the knot of problems is going to get ever tighter. According to T. Mazowiecki, the country is still only on the threshold of major changes and the government is trying not to waste time. There is no sphere of life where changes have not begun. It is impossible not to agree with this.

The process of personnel changes is making slow but sure progress. In the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU, former government press spokesman J. Urban gave a very definite opinion on this, commenting that the measures taken by the new ministers are more reminiscent of an ordinary purge than reforms. The first phase, in particular, has affected several of the main television editors and their deputies.

W. Sila-Nowicki, well known legal expert and former "Solidarity" counsellor, has also given his assessment of the government's actions. He has said that the group that united around L. Walesa and secured the concession of the opposition principle from the party and government side during the "roundtable" talks is presently engaged in replacing the PZPR's monopoly with its own.

The premier, who currently holds strong positions in his country, is coming to Moscow. Time and circumstance caused the appearance in Poland of precisely this head of government rather than any other, who, by his second choice for a foreign visit since entering office, has made the hierarchy of his Cabinet's interests clear.

Mazowiecki Thanks Soviet Leaders for Message

PM2311153189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Undated message from Polish Prime Minister Mazowiecki to Soviet leaders]

[Text] To Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
To Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

On behalf of the Polish people and ourselves we cordially thank you for your good wishes on the 71st anniversary of the restoration of Poland's state independence. We see this as confirmation of your friendship and understanding of the current changes in Poland.

We realize that the success of the process of change depends above all on ourselves. However, the assistance and benevolence of our friends and allies, along with the favorable international situation in which we are implementing these changes and on which the Soviet Union exerts considerable influence, are also of substantial significance.

Poland is still striving to develop comprehensive relations with the Soviet Union, relying on everything that unites us and eliminating everything here that impedes progress.

We are convinced that this approach will serve the interests of both countries and strengthen the genuine friendship between our peoples.

[Signed] Wojciech Jaruzelski, Polish president
Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers.

Gorbachev Message to Polish-Soviet Amity Society

PM2211124789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Message from M.S. Gorbachev, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society—date not given]

[Text] Dear friends!

I cordially greet the society's activists and all citizens of Poland who are making their personal contribution to the consolidation of good-neighborliness and cooperation between our countries.

We are not only witnesses to but also active participants in profound and complex processes of renewal and tempestuous changes taking place throughout the world. Each of our countries is undoubtedly helped in finding its way confidently in the present-day contradictions and in making headway by its adherence to the cause of the peoples' mutual respect and rapprochement. These are abiding humanist values. They have always, at all times, been shared, defended, and upheld by the best, leading representatives of Poland and Russia.

The public and leadership of the Soviet Union are sincerely grateful to your society for its multifaceted noble activity, which serves to deepen mutual understanding between millions of Polish and Soviet citizens and to expand the spheres of fruitful Polish-Soviet communication.

I am sure that your society will continue to creatively promote the conservation and augmentation of all the good traditions and achievements that have existed and continue to exist in Soviet-Polish collaboration.

I wish you prosperity and new strength and successes.

M. Gorbachev.

Jaruzelski Cited on European Security

PM2411125989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "With Great Hope"]

[Text] Warsaw, 17 Nov—Poland is watching European processes with great hope, while at the same time hoping that they harm no one and do not impede political equilibrium, Polish President W. Jaruzelski pointed out. He was speaking with K. Sorsa (Finland), chairman of the Socialist International's Consultative Council on Disarmament, and other members of the council.

W. Jaruzelski recalled the initiative M.S. Gorbachev put forward during his visit to Poland for a European center for nuclear threat reduction to be set up as a place for NATO-Warsaw Pact cooperation. This center, he pointed out, would be responsible for the full and identical implementation of arms limitation and stabilization measures and would conduct consultations and exchanges of information with a view to preventing conflicts in Europe.

Pointing out that Poland, the USSR, and other Warsaw Pact states have submitted a considerable number of peace initiatives, W. Jaruzelski advocated further steps to advance the lasting stabilization of the military situation in Europe. They must include, in his opinion, the following: a consistent endeavor to attain and implement most speedily an agreement at the Vienna talks; the

transformation of existing military structures into truly and absolutely defensive structures; the limitation of Europe's existing tactical nuclear weapons arsenals; the further development of security-and confidence-building systems within the framework of the CSCE process; and the inclusion of naval forces in confidence-building measures, starting with confidence-building measures in the Baltic. These ideas concluded with the desire to disarm the most dangerous area and the largest conglomeration of conventional armed forces' potentials on either side of the Elbe, which was considered until recently the border of confrontation. The further East and West from the Elbe it proves possible to roll back offensive systems and military forces, the greater the chances of that area being transformed in time into a zone of security where only the requisite defensive potential will exist and where there will, on the contrary, be no forces or systems that both sides mutually consider offensive.

New prospects for East-West cooperation are now emerging, the Polish president said, in all spheres—political, economic, and cultural. This obviously affects the deepening of disarmament processes on the European Continent.

Speaking about recent events in the GDR, W. Jaruzelski said Polish public opinion is pleased to welcome the changes taking place in the country of its Western neighbor, friend, and ally. They are of historic significance, and we expect them to strengthen rather than weaken the GDR's sovereign international positions.

Jaruzelski, Mazowiecki Meet With EEC Officials

PM2311132989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS dispatch: "New Prospects Opening up"]

[Text] Warsaw, 19 Nov—The processes of profound sociopolitical and economic transformations under way in Poland open up new prospects for all-European cooperation, President W. Jaruzelski of Poland said during a meeting with R. Dumas, chairman of the EC Council of Ministers and French foreign minister, and J. Delors, chairman of the EC Commission.

These changes, which are accompanied by an improvement in East-West relations, are conducive to expanding equal and mutually advantageous cooperation in all spheres and setting up new organizational structures to help overcome the existing division and support the process of building a common European home.

During the conversation the Polish president noted the importance of normalizing relations and developing mutually advantageous cooperation between Poland and the EC on the basis of the partners' understanding of the country's needs. Such collaboration can be an important factor in support of the process of transformations in the Polish economy and the building of a new socioeconomic order harmoniously combining high economic efficiency and social justice.

During their 2-day visit to Poland the EEC leaders also had meetings with T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, and members of the country's government. The economic situation in Poland and measures to stabilize it, questions pertaining to the Polish foreign debt, and development of relations with the "Common Market" were discussed. Specifically, proposals contained in the Polish Government memorandum handed to the EEC leadership were examined.

Rakowski Answers Sejm Critics of Previous Regime

PM2411123989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Poland: M. Rakowski's Speech"]

[Text] On Wednesday M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee, addressed members of an extraordinary Sejm commission set up to assess the activity of the previous Polish Government. He answered a number of charges from "Solidarity" parliamentarians leveled at the Council of Ministers he led during the period September 1988 through August 1989.

According to him, the reasons for the profound economic crisis that the country has hitherto been unable to overcome are diverse and some are rooted in Poland's economic past.

M. Rakowski absolutely denied the claim that 45 years of people's power had been in vain. Many opportunities were missed and the country was very late in implementing necessary reforms, but a firm foundation was laid during this period on which to build a future.

M. Rakowski admitted that he had made a mistake from the political viewpoint by agreeing during his government's last few days in existence to transfer the food complex to a market basis. This difficult decision should have been left to the new cabinet rather than easing its position by doing the most difficult thing ourselves, he said.

Ethnic Poles Form Cultural Association

LD1811125589 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1105 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] The Polish House Cultural Association is being created in Moscow. Details in a telephone report:

[Reporter] This is an initiative of the Polonian circles in the RSFSR, and harking back to the tradition of similar organizations once on the territory of Tsarist Russia and later the Soviet Union until the mid-1930's. Representatives came from large Polish circles in Kazakhstan and Siberia and smaller ones in Central Russia, and of course from Moscow itself. The founding committee presented

the draft statute of the organization and also an appeal to Poles in the Soviet Union, from which I would like to cite a small part:

Why until now, we read in the document, do we remain a forgotten minority? Why are the problems of Soviet Poles shamefully passed over in silence? After all, there are around 2 million of us here, no fewer than there are of Germans, Crimean Tatars, or representatives of other nationalities. Let us thus unify our efforts, let our mutual cause, we read on in the document, serve the rebirth of national identity, the maintenance of language, traditions, and culture, so that in years to come we will not have to reply to the question of our children: Where are we from?

Reportage on CSSR Unrest, Leadership Changes

Miners Express Support for Jakes

PM2411114389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting With Miners"]

[Text] Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee, met with representatives of party, trade union, and youth organizations and progressive workers in the North Bohemian Lignite Basin.

The miners shared their misgivings with him over the current situation in the country and expressed readiness to help relieve the tension. Working people stressed that they support the statement issued by the CSSR, Czech Socialist Republic, and Slovakia Governments regarding the events in Prague 17 November and oppose intentions to declare a general strike.

The miners advocated the consistent implementation of the program of restructuring and democratization in the interests of the further development of socialist society. They confirmed that the basin's labor collectives will not accept economic chaos and the political destabilization of society.

The CPCZ Central Committee general secretary thanked the miners for their clear viewpoint and support for party policy. He said that the CPCZ leadership will endeavor to halt negative development in society by political means.

Strike May Depend on CPCZ Plenum Outcome

PM2411161689 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov report: "Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCZ) Central Committee Plenum Begins Work"]

[Text] Prague—For several evenings in succession Wenceslas Square has been packed with people. For the first few days it was said that some 200,000 people had gathered here. In the evening of 23 November the CTK agency reported 300,000. I was in the square, and had difficulty making my way through the people. I saw how many more people were standing in the adjoining streets. Therefore I would be more inclined to support the estimate of my colleague, a TASS correspondent—about half a million people (let me remind you that the population of Prague is 1.2 million).

In the square there was once again criticism of the CSSR's party and state leadership. There were students standing near me, holding a Czechoslovak state flag. A wind was blowing, and from time to time the flag brushed against me, winding itself round my face and head. The young people would turn to me at once: "Sorry!"

At 1600 hours, from the balcony of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party's "Melantrich" publishing house, the well-known artist Rudolf Hrusinsky and playwright Vaclav Havel addressed those present. Havel called on the army and the security corps to "join them."

Demonstrations also took place in the central square of Bratislava, the newspapers write, involving several tens of thousands of people. As RUDE PRAVO reports, Alexander Dubcek took part.

There is much talk here about the 2-hour general strike planned for Monday. Will it take place? Some people see the answer to this question as being dependent on the results of the CPCZ Central Committee plenum. Another question: Will the working class support the strike? To judge by items in the newspaper RUDE PRAVO and television interviews, the majority of workers are against the strike: "We do not want chaos, we do not want to end up like Poland." But the students' main demands are supported by practically everyone. During the demonstration there were many banners fluttering over the square giving the names of well-known Prague plants, factories, and working-class districts: CKD, Kbely, Modrany... I talked with workers from the "Lifty-Praha" enterprise, who are responsible for elevator maintenance throughout the city. They said: We are for the strike, if it is necessary, we will take part, but we will make up the 2 hours later, probably on Tuesday. The national economy must not suffer. People should not have to spend an extra day walking up to an upper story because we did not do our job. But the strike has its purpose: a signal, a warning.

According to the leaders of the "Civic Forum" organization, about 500 plants and factories have stated that they "agree to hold a warning strike." The idea of making up the 2 hours of the strike later meets with support everywhere.

Today's newspapers are peppered with forceful headlines. The Central Council of Trade Unions has come out against the strike in principle: "We regard the strike call as a risky game with serious political, social, and economic consequences, and not a means of asserting the goals of restructuring and democratization." A CSSR

Government session heard a report from the republic's general prosecutor on the progress of the investigation of the factors leading to the actions by the law and order organs on 17 November; the government demanded that the investigation be speeded up in view of the political importance of the case. CSSR Minister of National Defense Army General Milan Vaclavik appealed for calm and order on television and radio. "The most important thing today is civic responsibility and honest, conscientious labor," he said. "We will achieve nothing through social chaos and demonstrations."

Hundreds of thousands of labor collectives, local organs of power, and social organizations are hurrying to express their views and positions. Many of them are finding their way into the newspapers. RUDE PRAVO reports that in recent days the newspaper's print run has increased considerably: On Saturday it is planned to print at least 1.6 million copies. And newspapers like SVOBODNE SLOVO and LIDOVO DEMOKRACIE (the organs of the Socialist Party and the People's Party) sell out at the newspaper kiosks early in the morning, as I myself have witnessed.

An extraordinary CPCZ Central Committee plenum is being held in Prague from the morning of 24 November. "The tense situation in the capital of our republic became even more acute on Thursday," RUDE PRAVO writes in this connection. The newspaper stresses that the plenum will express its views on the political situation in the country and adopt decisions designed to overcome the present crisis situation.

CPCZ Seen 'Lagging Behind' Events

PM2411181589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch: "Rallies Continue"]

[Text] Prague, 24 Nov—The inhabitants of Prague are now calling Wenceslas Square opinion forum. Huge rallies have been held there for 6 days running. Yesterday around 500,000 people representing various social movements and political parties gathered in the square and adjoining streets. The demonstrators were carrying hundreds of banners demanding democracy, justice for all, and free elections to organs of power... I did not see a single banner demanding the dismantling of socialism or the abandonment by Czechoslovakia of the socialist path of development.

Many calls were voiced at the rally for a general strike to be held 27 November. A representative of the CKD Combine stated that more than 500 labor collectives backed it.

Rallies and demonstrations are being held virtually throughout the country. In Bratislava, for instance, around 100,000 people assembled for a rally. The strike call is not supported everywhere, but each rally mentions the excessive actions taken by the security forces against the peaceful student demonstration 17 November. As is well known, the Socialist Youth Union was one of the first organizations to condemn this action. Talking about the domestic political situation, Vasil Mohorita, chairman of the Socialist Youth Union, stated in a speech at an extraordinary conference of Socialist Youth Union kraj committee leaders that it would be a mistake to underestimate the complexity of the situation.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the further development of the domestic political situation will depend to a considerable extent on what decisions are made by today's Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee plenum. The party is lagging behind the development of events. As Communists at the Charles University's Natural Sciences Faculty stated in the newspaper RUDE PRAVO today, "The CPCZ finds itself on the brink of a crisis within the party and internationally isolated as a result of the wait-and-see policy adopted by the leadership." At the same time, the authority of party utterances remains high. It all depends on what those utterances are.

Speaking yesterday to workers at the CKD Combine, Miroslav Stepan, first secretary of Prague CPCZ City Committee, stated that the plenum would discuss a program of action for the immediate future and carry out cadre changes, which have not been prompted by outside pressure.

25 Nov CPCZ Plenum Decisions Reported

PM2611180189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch: "New CPCZ Leadership. Karel Urbanek Elected General Secretary of CPCZ Central Committee"]

[Text] Prague, 25 Nov—The tense sociopolitical situation that has emerged in Czechoslovakia over the past week reached its zenith Friday evening. Another demonstration, in which over 300,000 people took part, was held in Prague's Wenceslas Square. Major rallies were held in Bratislava and a number of other cities. More and more workers are leaning toward the idea of a general strike, scheduled for Monday 27 November. But it is not only these events that are alarming society.

Everyone's attention, including that of speakers at the rallies, was fixed on the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] Central Committee Extraordinary Plenum. It had the historic responsibility of deciding which route the further development of events would take. The route of confrontation and exacerbation of the domestic political situation or the route of dialogue and a search for solutions suiting all society.

The report on the domestic political situation delivered at the plenum by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, although it contained elements of self-criticism and an admission of partial blame for the prevailing situation, did not satisfy the plenum

participants. More than 70 people asked to speak. Rejoinders were shouted from the floor.

The plenum participants stressed the seriousness of the current domestic political situation in the CSSR and made a critical assessment of the party leadership's activities under the current complex conditions. Many speeches demanded the resignation of the current leadership and the adoption of an action program for the immediate future. Under the onslaught of criticism, Milos Jakes stated on his own behalf and on behalf of the members and candidate members of the CPCZ Central Committee Secretariat and Presidium that the entire Party leadership was submitting its resignation.

The plenum set up three working organs: commissions on proposals, cadre issues, and the press. Once a list of candidates for the leading positions had been compiled, a discussion of the candidacies began. Karel Urbanek, 48, who had previously been chairman of the CPCZ Central Committee's Committee for Party Work in Czech Krajs, was elected the new general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee by secret ballot. Until 1987 he was first secretary of Brno City Party Committee and was then briefly the chief of the CPCZ Central Committee Political Organization Department. K. Urbanek was elected a member of the CPCZ Central Committee at the 17th CPCZ Congress. He has been a member of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium since October 1988.

The new Presidium comprises K. Urbanek, J. Cizek, M. Huscava, I. Janak, I. Knotek, J. Lenart, M. Stepan, M. Zajic, and M. Zavadil.

J. Haman, V. Herman, M. Nemcova, and O. Saling were elected candidate members of the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium.

The Central Committee secretaries are K. Urbanek (general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee), I. Knotek, J. Lenart, M. Zajic, F. Hanus, and O. Liska.

K. Urbanek, I. Knotek, J. Lenart, M. Zajic, F. Hanus, O. Liska, Z. Horeni, J. Mevald, and V. Mohorita became members of the CPCZ Central Committee Secretariat.

The new Central Committee Presidium did not include seven former members, not least CSSR President Gustav Husak, Federal Premier Ladislav Adamec, who resigned from this post, Alois Indra, chairman of the Federal Assembly, and Jan Fojtik, the CPCZ Central Committee secretary in charge of ideological questions.

K. Urbanek made the closing speech at the plenum. He said: On behalf of the entire CPCZ Central Committee Presidium and Secretariat, I want to thank you for the trust you have placed in us. We recognize the responsibility we are shouldering at this critical time for our party and society. We must act so as to convincingly show the working class, the cooperativized peasantry, the intelligentsia, and all citizens the sincerity of the party's aspirations to restructure and democratize economic and social life. With a comprehensive approach to perestroyka, current events are highlighting the need for rapid progress on political reform. The tense situation in the country can only be overcome by political means. The main task is to return our society—particularly the capital—as quickly as possible to the conditions of normal life and everyday creative and constructive work. The development of friendship and cooperation with the USSR and other socialist countries will continue to be the foundation of our foreign policy line. We advocate good contacts and mutually advantageous cooperation with all other states.

Permit me to thank Comrade M. Jakes for the work he has done as general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. I express my gratitude for their cooperation to all the other comrades who are now leaving the Central Committee Presidium and Secretariat, particularly those who have done a great deal of work for our party and society in top party posts—Comrades G. Husak, A. Indra, L. Adamec, J. Fojtik, and K. Hoffmann.

The plenum resolution noted that the party and state leadership failed to cope with the situation. It was decided to convene an extraordinary Party Central Committee plenum no later than the first half of December. The plenum demanded a thorough investigation into the 17 November events, and considered the actions of the law enforcement organs to be a political mistake. At the same time, the document stated, the plenum does not consider protest demonstrations and strikes to be an acceptable means of solving social problems.

The CPCZ Central Committee Plenum adopted a document relating to the principles of policy in the forthcoming period. It stated that the CPCZ will begin dialogue with everyone who recognizes the CSSR Constitution. Within the framework of the National Front, it is planned to set up equal representation for all political parties and leading social organizations. Laws on meetings and demonstrations, young people and the family, and a new press law will be adopted in the very near future.

At the press conference which opened immediately after the plenum at 0300 hours on 25 November, the question was raised of whether the article enshrining the leading role of the party would remain in the CSSR Constitution. Zdenek Horeni, member of the CPCZ Central Committee Secretariat and chief editor of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO, replied that this question would be discussed during the preparation of the new constitution.

The CPCZ has witnessed the biggest changes in its leadership in the past 20 years. But the situation in the country remains complex. The question of a general warning strike has not gone away. A nationwide student strike committee is in operation. The direction the political barometer will take will be come clear over the

next few days—or perhaps the next 24 hours. A great deal depends on the first steps taken by the new Party leadership.

Havel, Dubcek Address Prague Crowds

LD2511202189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] An extraordinary plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] has elected Karel Urbanek the new general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. Our correspondent Vladimir Taranov in Czechoslovakia reports:

[Taranov] The news was received with approval by thousands of citizens on the streets and squares of the Czech capital. In Wenceslas Square mass students' and workers' demonstrations took place. Vaclav Havel, spokesman for the civil forum organization; Alexander Dubcek, former first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; members of the Czech Socialist Party; and others spoke to those gathered. They underlined the need for changes in society leading to increased democratization and glasnost.

On Prague streets, order is being maintained. Everywhere Czech national flags are flying. People are in an uplifting, happy mood. There is a feeling that truly revolutionary, progressive changes are taking place.

Today is Saturday, a day off. However, on the Prague streets the discussion is continuing. People are discussing the expediency of carrying out a 2-hour general strike on 27 November. At several enterprises the decision has been taken to take part in the strike, but then, in free time, to work the 2 hours.

CSSR Opposition Seen Lacking Clear-Cut Plans

LD2511140389 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 25 Nov 89

["Czechoslovak People Hope for a Way Out of the Crisis"—TASS headline]

[Text] Prague November 25 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevsky and Vitaliy Yaroshevsky:

Last Friday was of special importance in the chronology of November events in Prague. The Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee held an extraordinary plenary meeting. The entire country, including those present at a rally in Wenceslas Square awaited its decisions.

The plenum elected Karel Urbanek a new general secretary of the party's Central Committee in secret ballot by a majority of votes, and elected a new composition of the Presidium and Secretariat of the party's Central Committee.

The internal political situation in the country was also discussed at a plenary meeting of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party Central Committee on Friday.

In a speech at the plenum, Bohuslav Kucera, chairman of the party, called for holding a meeting reprsentatives of all political parties, major political forces united in the National Front, with the participation of all civil initiatives and, possibly, the church soon.

Czechoslovakia is in the heart of Europe, Kucera emphasised. "We should bear in mind that there are forces in the West that, while lauding the democratisation taking place in the country, have not abandoned revanchism. There is no and cannot be any alternative to us apart from alliance with the Soviet Union which is the only real force that can stop revanchist attempts," he said.

The plenum of the Czechoslovak Socialist Party Central Committee called for the formation of a government of national accord that could function until the holding of democratic and free elections.

A mass rally again took place in Wenceslas Square on Friday. Those present were addressed by Alexander Dubcek who stated in particular that the current crisis in the country was brought about by military interference in the affairs and life of the Czechoslovak people.

Vaclav Havel emphasised in his speech that the Civil Forum is prepared to have dialogue with authorities. Those present at the meeting again demanded free elections and more resolute carrying out of radical reforms in all fields of society's life.

Spokesmen for the Civil Forum said at a news conference that the general strike scheduled for November 27 would be called even if radical reappointments are made in the Czechoslovak Communist Party leadership.

The decision to call a strike is supported by many enterprises. The work collectives stated that it would be of a symbolic nature and would not do serious damage to the national economy.

Plants and shops with continuous production cycle would not be brought to a standstill. Hospitals and transport would continue to function.

At the same time a number of big industrial enterprises do not support the idea of a general strike. Such is, for example, the attitude of Ostrava steelworkers and miners of the Severocesky brown coal basin.

The situation in Prague and other Czechoslovak cities remains uncertain, tinged with emotion and not without a tint of political romanticism.

One gathers the impression that the opposition does not have so far a harmonious and clear-cut action programme. Possibly, it is only being shaped up.

Following the extraordinary plenary meeting of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, many working people hope that it is precisely the Communist Party, with a membership of 1.7 milion, that will offer such a programme to society, a programme to take the country out of the crisis.

All those who are not indifferent to the future of the socialist republic may participate in shaping such a programme, people repeatedly emphasised.

Prague Demonstrations 'Not Letting Up'

LD2611094689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] No doubt many of our listeners today are interested in what is going on in Czechoslovakia. Now, one could answer that profound revolutionary transformations are going on there with the aim of improving socialism, deepening democratization and extending glasnost. Vladimir Taranov, our correspondent in Prague, explains:

[Taranov] Prague is literally seething. The thousands-strong demonstrations are not letting up. Their participants are demanding the immediate removal of several members of the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] who have compromised themselves and have no right to remain in the leadership. A week ago, nobody could have guessed that the Czech and Slovak people would take to the streets and declare in such determined fashion that there was a need for change. The tension in society has not waned since the extraordinary plenum of the CPCZ [Communist Party of Czechoslovakia] Central Committee. In the course of discussions, various points of view are to be encountered. However one of them is predominant: The citizens of the CSSR are emphatically in favor of socialism and democracy. The irreproachable organization and great discipline of the students and workers who are taking part in the discussion ought to be mentioned. Most have advocated a 2-hour general strike on 27 November, the aim of which is to demonstrate the need for radical change in society. Karel Urbanek, the new general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee spoke at a rally of activists from the Prague CPCZ organizations. Here is what he had to say:

[Begin Urbanek recording in Czech, with translation provided by Taranov] I was elected to the post of general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee a few hours ago. I must admit that it was a shock for me. The situation remains very difficult. Today every person has the right to voice his point of view. The situation within the party could be more favorable if the CPCZ were more united and if we did not waste time. Today it is essential to act without a moment's delay. All the proposals must be closely scrutinized, all the problems answered, and we must prove that the CPCZ can solve them in the very near future. [end recording]

[Taranov] The communists and working people in the CSSR advocate the convocation of a new plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee which would again review personnel matters; they want more workers and peasants among the leadership of the CPCZ; and they want direct elections to the local and central bodies of power. The absolute majority of people in the CSSR want the top state posts to be occupied by competent people, so that Czechoslovakia might occupy a worthy place in the future European home.

[Announcer] Well, events in Czechoslovakia are changing very rapidly, and the situation could radically change literally every hour. And now we have received a report that another extraordinary plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee is to be held today in Czechoslovakia—in Prague. As it happens, topical organizational and political matters will be discussed at this plenum.

Adamec Addresses 26 Nov Rally

LD2611192589 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 26 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevsky and Vitaliy Yaroshevsky:

A rally of many thousands was held in the Letna Field in Prague today. Chairman of the Czechoslovak Government Ladislav Adamec addressed the rally.

He said that the essence of the government's dialogue with representatives of the civic forum is the quest of rapprochement among people with different views.

"We are united by the striving to resolve a crisis situation in society by political means," Adamec said. He said that for this reason the government is prepared to talk to everyone who is concerned over the country's future.

The implementation of fair political demands should not lag behind the striving to improve the economic situation. So it is necessary to stop strikes and demonstrations, the chairman of the Czechoslovak Government said.

Playwright Vaclav Havel, one of the leaders of the civic forum, thanked the premier for the goodwill and the readiness for negotiations. He said that the general strike planned for tomorrow should be held only in token, in order not to damage the national economy. "Our wish is that it should function better," Havel said.

Movement Toward Dialogue Noted

LD2611213989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Nov 89

[From the "Seven Days" program]

[Text] The changes in Czechoslovakia were almost the most important event in the past week. Today's commentary from the REUTER agency calls the processes in Czechoslovakia a new Prague Spring, which has commenced in late autumn. AGENCE FRANCE PRESS has paid attention to the statement by Karel Urbanek, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, on his readiness to hold a dialogue even with those who left or were forced to leave the Communist Party after 1968. Social and political processes are developing in different ways in the socialist countries. Here is a report from our correspondent.

[Andreyev] The first snow fell in Prague this week. There is usually great joy at this, but this time it seems no one noticed the arrival of winter. It has been too hot in the Prague streets these past revolutionary 7 days. Historians may not agree with me, but this is what I say: Something good and cleansing has happened; that which could not but happen in the end has happened. No one can say now what will come next. People may call me a romantic, but I know that sometimes one word can give people back their faith and carry them along behind it. Yesterday evening they heard a true word at last: Speaking on television, Karel Urbanek, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, said party functionaries had lost touch with people, with their interests, with the truth and with everyday life and saw everything in an invented light, through rose-colored glasses. We have remembered now, Karel Urbanek stressed especially, how important it is to tell the truth. Having thrown off its previous prejudices, the party will move together with all those who want to work for the good of the country. [video shows Andreyev sitting on steps at base of St. Wenceslas statue on Wenceslas Square; Urbanek speaking to camera]

An important word, unexpected for many, was heard at a rally that comprised half of Prague. Playwriter Vaclav Havel, the chief dissident for the previous party leadership, suddenly said something good about Ladislav Adamec, chairman of the government—who, it turns out, has for a year proposed to the leaders of the CPCZ Central Committee several times, both verbally and in writing, that they should start a dialogue with all social forces. [video shows Havel addressing rally]

Adamec himself, in spite of his request to resign, will continue to head the government for the time being. In an interview with Czechoslovak Television he said he was proposing that representatives of other parties and social movements be brought into the government to supplement it. [video shows Adamec speaking to newsmen]

Primary party organizations have stopped being constantly approving and have put in their own word. A resolution was submitted at an assembly of the Prague party aktiv yesterday: The communists believe the cadre changes carried out at the plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee are inadequate and demand the plenum be convoked again, and also demand an extraordinary party congress. The CPCZ Central Committee plenum commenced work today. [video shows assembly in session, shot of Wenceslas Square]

Mass Meetings Continue in Bratislava

LD2611162189 Moscow TASS in English 1531 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Bratislava November 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Kuleshov:

A meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia is in progress in Bratislava since this morning. It will be followed by an extraordinary plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Slovakia. The party leaders of the republic are discussing the political situation within the republic.

Mass meetings and demonstrations continue in Bratislava, Kosice, Banska Bystrica and other cities. Their participants demand democratic transformations to overcome the crisis.

Calls for holding on November 27 a two-hour general political strike were made at a mass rally in the central square of the Slovak capital on Saturday evening. The meeting was attended by many thousands.

Student organisations pasted up in the city statements and leaflets which sum up the personnel changes made at the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as insufficient.

There are demands to abrogate the constitutional provision which registers the leading role of the Party in the life of society. There are demands for establishing political pluralism and for the holding of free elections.

In its special issue, the Slovak newspaper PRAVDA carries today resolutions and statements of numerous party organisations, of individual communists and work collectives. They make various appraisals of the situation and suggest various approaches to overcome it.

New CPCZ Chief Urges Negotiation

LD2711092989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Correspondent Aleksandr Samylin report from Prague]

[Text] There are no days off now in the country's political life. There are mass meetings, demonstrations, discussions, and emergency sessions of party committees and government bodies. Everyone wants to say what he feels about what is going on. As a public opinion poll has shown, the overwhelming majority does not agree with the incomplete personnel changes in the Central Committee Presidium. And so things are continuing.

The television apperance by General Secretary Karel Urbanek went some way toward defusing the situation. He is quite determined to see the transformations through to the end, but noted that to do this he needs the confidence of the people.

We must get around the negotiating table with everyone who wishes his country well, Karel Urbanek said. To get around it without any prejudices or suspicion—that is the main thing at the present time. Otherwise, we will not find a way out. It lies in a realistic approach, not in good wishes. This goes equally for those who, after 1968, left or were obliged to leave the party. I believe that once we get a dialogue going we will find a common language.

And now a few words about other events of importance. By a decision of the president of the republic, an amnesty has been declared for prisoners arrested under the article dealing with violation of public order and subversive activity. The representatives of the mass organizations that have again sprung up have been given the opportunity to voice their views. The 2-hour general strike on Monday has not been removed from the agenda. Students have also resolved not to resume their studies yet.

[Announcer] We have just received a report that an extraordinary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] has been held in Prague. A report was delivered by Karel Urbanek, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, who proposed convening an extraordinary congress of the CPCZ on 26 January 1990. He also recommended that a broad political coalition—an equal association of political parties, public organizations, and groups that advocate socialism—should be set up on the platform of the National Front.

Failure To Reform Seen Fostering CSSR Unrest

PM2611192189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch under the rubric "Commentary of the Day": "Lessons of Demonstrations"]

[Text] Prague—The events of the last few days in Czechoslovakia came as a surprise to many people. All of a sudden, in a country living a calm, measured life, every square and intersection was seething with people. Several hundred thousand people began to assemble for some rallies.

The day that is regarded as the start of the events is 17 November, when units of the National Security Corps attempted to disperse a student demonstration, as a result of which 38 people were injured. The students immediately declared a strike, which was supported by creative unions. Theaters closed in the country. Rallies began in the squares, with workers joining in. But that is no more than the mechanical framework of the events. The affair of the student demonstration was merely the fuse that landed on combustible material.

People who have been following the course of Czechoslovakia's life will note without fail that the tension began to mount not just today or even yesterday. The reason for that is the stagnation that had begun to stifle society. The process of democratization, of which there had been so much talk in recent years, in practice has made no headway. Economic programs are not being fulfilled. The 5-year plan, which in theory is supposed to give the national economy its second wind, is a failure in terms of all its indicators. The only sector that is working with stability is agriculture, as a result of which it is proving possible to curb the decline in living standards. The CPCZ [Communist Party of Czechoslovakia] leadership, which is simultaneously the leadership of the state, knows about all these problems.

December 1987 saw a CPCZ Central Committee plenum on which the people pinned great hopes. Milos Jakes was elected as the new general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. After this many decisions aimed at expediting perestroyka, imparting greater dynamism to society, and eradicating negative phenomena were elaborated and adopted. All these decisions and programs met with the broadest support from working people. The party had a good opportunity to become the real vanguard of society's renewal and to sharply increase its prestige.

But these opportunities were not exploited. The emergent process of democratization began to be wound down, the economic reform faltered, and priority was given to rigid forms of management. Any criticism of the leadership's actions was suppressed. And when a year ago people first took to the streets in demonstrations, official propaganda attributed this to the intrigues of Western subversive centers.

The events taking place in neighboring socialist countries seemingly did not affect Czechoslovakia. Everything that was being done in them was proclaimed to be the "funeral" of socialism. Naturally, this situation could not last long. The country was in dire need of reforms, and the people realized this perfectly well. But the leadership could not bring itself to embark on profound changes. It temporized, hesitated, and took two steps back for every step forward. The events of 17 November, which took the form of a student revolution, as people here call the youth movement, graphically demonstrated that the people were tired of waiting.

A rapid politicization of society began in the country. A national student strike committee was formed. It was supported by many worker collectives as well as creative unions. The threat of a general strike arose. It was in these conditions that the extraordinary CPCZ Central Committee plenum met. At it, Under a barrage of criticism, the party's entire leadership resigned. A new Central Committee Presidium was elected in which there was no place for the former general secretary, the president of the CSSR, the chairman of the government, nor the chief ideologist who had headed that most important sector of party work for many years. The plenum announced that the party is prepared to begin a dialogue with all political forces recognizing the CSSR Constitution.

Can what has happened be called a revolution? I think it is still too early to attach a definition to the current events in Czechoslovakia. Everything will depend on the specific steps taken by the new leadership. One thing is clear: Within the CPCZ and Czechoslovak society the page dividing them from the events of 1968 has been turned. The first step has been taken toward dismantling the Stalinist system which existed here untouched for

many years. The path may zigzag, it may be cautious, but there will be no return to the past. Czechoslovak society has matured by an entire historical period of time. The slogan "We want to live in a free, democratic, and prosperous Czechoslovakia" has united many people.

The Communist Party's political partners in the National Front took a different view of their role in society. The leadership of the Socialist Party reacted swiftly and harshly to the events of 17 November. By unequivocally siding with the students and the groups of the population supporting them, the Socialist Party certainly gained political capital. That cannot be ignored. Friday's plenum of this party's Central Committee stressed that it advocates equal rights and equal opportunities for all citizens and political parties.

Other political parties are also reevaluating their earlier positions. An organization uniting several social movements and calling itself "Civic Forum" has emerged. Judging by the way its representatives are greeted at the huge rallies, it too enjoys the support of a certain section of the population.

Czechoslovakia is again at a crossroads. The natural and logical process of the renewal of socialism, which began earlier in other East European countries, is taking place there. How difficult and problematic this process will be largely depends on the Communist Party's new leadership. It has before it the experience of other countries, and there are advantages in this.

Medvedev, Others Meet CPCZ's Fojtik 17 Nov

PM2311144389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 17 November V.A. Medvedev, CPSU Central Committee secretary and Politburo member, met with J. Fojtik, secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee and member of the Presidium, who is paying a short working visit to Moscow.

They discussed topical questions relating to the activity of the two fraternal parties and the improvement of cooperation between them in the ideological sphere.

A.S. Kapto, head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, and J. Rehorek, CSSR ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

On the same day J. Fojtik had a meeting with I.T. Frolov, chief editor of PRAVDA, and G.L. Smirnov, director of the CPSU Central Committee Marxism-Leninism Institute.

CPSU Group Views Local Self-Management in CSSR

PM2311145589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Studying Friends' Experience"]

[Text] A delegation from the CPSU Central Committee Legal Policy Commission, headed by V.P. Mysnichenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Kharkov Ukrainian Communist Party Oblast Committee, was in the CSSR 13-17 November at the invitation of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee. They had conversations at the CPCZ Central Committee, the CSSR Government, law enforcement departments, and local organs of power regarding experience in switching to territorial self-management and the legal regulation of this process in Czechoslovakia.

The delegation was received by J. Lenart, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

GDR Border Clampdown, Honecker Indictment Noted

PM2411164789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy report: "GDR: Tough Measures"]

[Text] The time of smiling faces on the border has passed, because in the 2 weeks that the new provision on travel to the West has been in force a vast quantity of goods, produce, and antiques, and a large amount of money has been taken out of the GDR, a GDR Government press spokesman has stated.

On Friday measures taken by the Council of Ministers came into force which, it is believed, will considerably reduce that flow and instill order on the transport routes passing across the republic's territory.

First, customs control on the GDR border with the FRG and West Berlin is being tightened up. The customs service is being reinforced with staff and given an extra allocation of special equipment. Second, certain industrial goods, clothing, and foodstuffs will henceforth be issued only to citizens of the GDR and foreigners permanently employed in the country. Sales staff will be empowered to ask for presentation of the relevant documents. Interior Ministry staffers and representatives of the customs agencies and workers' and peasants' inspectorate will be on duty in stores where there has been an influx of foreign customers. Third, deviation from the transit routes from Poland to the FRG and West Berlin is now banned. Those traveling by rail must not change trains. All these measures apply to USSR citizens as well.

Replying to journalists' questions, the government spokesman said that neither monetary reform nor a devaluation of the mark is anticipated in the GDR.

There has been a meeting of the Central Party Control Commission. By decision of the commission, Guenter Mittag, former member of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo, has been expelled from the SED. The commission has begun the party investigation of charges against Erich Honecker.

The report of the doctors treating him, that he cannot testify at present because of his state of health, was taken into account.

Leadership's Economic Dilemma Viewed

LD2411132989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] A session of the GDR Council of Ministers has been held in Berlin to discuss the economic situation there. Our correspondent Aleksandr Zubenko reports from the GDR capital:

[Zubenko] The GDR has accumulated many problems requiring urgent solution. It is necessary to stabilize the market without delay, put the financial mechanism in order, and restructure the work of the republic's combines and enterprises.

The GDR has not been well served by its statistical service, which has in the past been geared more to propaganda than economics. The situation in the country has particularly worsened in connection with the opening of the frontiers on 9 November and the free exit of citizens to the FRG and West Berlin. The black market has been very quick to flourish. Speculation in marks and goods has begun. Many people, in the rush for hard currency, have started withdrawing their savings from the banks. Many GDR newspapers are now writing about this with concern. It was to this whole complex of problems that the session of the Council of Minsters was devoted.

The government finds itself in a difficult position. Almost anything that might be done now will affect the standard of living of the citizens. Judging by the experience of other socialist countries that have begun restructuring, it is hardly likely. There is no doubt that the measures to put the regulations on travelling abroad in order, and the introduction on more precise customs rules, will not please everyone; but what we have seen in the GDR over the past fortnight—I am referring to the question of foreign travel—looks more like anarchy than freedom to leave the country.

The state must protect the interests of the majority of its citizens, and this was discussed at the session of the GDR Council of Ministers. The changes occurring in the Republic directly affect the interests of its Western neighbors, especially the FRG and West Berlin. In West Berlin, for example, there are now queues in the shops, something that has never happened before. Prices of some goods have gone up. Alongside the Poles, who for the last year have had almost complete control of the black market in West Berlin, dealers from the GDR have begun to put in an appearance.

Speaking recently at an enterprise in the GDR, the general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee, Egon Krenz, said that merely tightening controls on the frontier will not rectify the situation: Serious measures are needed to produce a healthier economy. This is possibly the most important task for the government of the republic at the present time.

Negative Effects of GDR Border Opening Foreseen

PM2411114189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p3

[Unattributed report: "Waiting in Expectation at the Brandenburg Gates"]

[Text] The "pilgrimage" to the Brandenburg Gates, which stand on the border between the GDR and West Berlin, did not cease even at the weekend. Thousands of local residents, visitors from both German states, and foreign guests were here on Saturday evening.

Dozens of television and radio companies and newspaper editorial offices have set up base right by the border on the West Berlin side. "Strike while the iron is hot"—this truth seems particularly relevant here. A bearded "businessman" of 18-20 years of age is busy selling fragments of "the wall" as "relics" at 1, 5, and 10 marks apiece, depending on their size.

The majority of Germans who have come here are impatiently awaiting an important moment: the opening of another crossing point—the main one, in their view—into the GDR capital.

Meanwhile, the tone of general jubilation which dominated just several days ago is gradually giving way to sober analysis of realities. Overcrowded highways and railroad and metro lines, the onslaught to which stores have been subjected, the crowds and bustle everywhere, and the piles of garbage—all this is no longer arousing tender feelings among West Berliners. And the prospect of an explosion of speculation in goods and hard currency, the appearance of a black market in manpower, and the penetration of drug addiction and AIDS does not inspire optimism in GDR citizens....

'Shortfalls' Noted in GDR-USSR Trade Protocol

LD2311134889 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1538 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The volume of trade between the GDR and the USSR will total about 61 billion marks next year. This is provided by a trade protocol for 1990 between the two countries which was signed in Moscow today between foreign trade ministers Dr Gerhard Beil and Konstantin Katushev.

Speaking to GDR correspondents, Dr Beil described the protocol as a very good document which safeguards the urgently needed raw materials and fuels for GDR industry, and creates decisive preconditions for the necessary changes in the GDR economy: 99.4% of the raw materials requested by the GDR had been agreed on.

The protocol includes those aspects which both sides were able to promise with full responsibility. Minister

Beil said that the GDR's foreign trade surplus with the USSR would amount to around R200 million up to the end of the year. It has been agreed to gradually redress the balance in 1990.

The document states that the USSR, in line with the long-term agreements for 1986-90, will, among other things, continue deliveries of 17.1 million cubic meters of crude oil, 4.5 million tonnes of coal, 7.9 billion cubic meters of natural and liquid gas, rolled steel products, and nonferrous heavy metals. Other important elements are products in engineering, electrical technology, and the aircraft industry. In addition, the GDR will import various consumer products from the Soviet Union. Agreements were made on the delivery of 14,000 Lada, Moskvich, and Zaporozhets automobiles. The GDR's request for higher imports have therefore not been met.

Approximately 70% of the GDR's deliveries to its major trading partner will consist of engineering products. Products in electrical engineering and electronics and the chemical industry will also be exported. With regard to a number of items, it was not possible to meet the USSR's purchasing requirements to their full extent, because GDR enterprises believe that scope for deliveries of, among other things, plastics and elastics technology, textiles, construction engineering, and hermetic compressors, is at present inadequate. The GDR's export program also includes consumer goods, such as furniture, crockery, clothing, and pharmaceuticals, which is seen in close conjunction with the delivery of raw materials by the Soviet side.

Dr Beil and Konstantin Katuchev also discussed current shortfalls in mutual deliveries. These apply, inter alia, to Soviet deliveries of mixed coking coal, sawn timber, and pulp wood, and on the GDR side, machine tools, chemical plant, agricultural technology, and certain consumer goods. The protocol states that intensive work is being carried out to make up these shortfalls.

CPSU's Falin, SPD's Diengels Discuss Ties

LD2511132589 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 25 TASS—Valentin Falin, member of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee and head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, met Hans-Eberhard Diengels, secretary of the board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), at the CPSU Central Committee today.

They exchanged views on topical processes taking place in Europe.

A number of matters concerning the development of contacts between the CPSU and SPD were discussed during the meeting which was held in a friendly atmosphere.

GDR Paper Notes Reunification 'Not on Agenda'

90UI0127A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 p 3

[TASS report: "NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on Reunification"]

[Text] Berlin, 14 November—"Since the new rules for travel to the FRG came into force, almost 4 million inhabitants of the GDR have visited West Berlin. They are pleased with the opportunities to visit with relatives and friends and to get a closer look at the capitalist reality. But anyone who believes that they are 'voting with their feet' for the reunification of Germany is profoundly mistaken." This is stated in a commentary published today in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee organ NEUES DEUTSCHLAND.

Making the borders more permeable, which was discussed recently by E. Krenz on the telephone with Chancellor H. Kohl, in no way casts doubt on the existing borders, writes NEUES DEUTSCHLAND. Any issue may be put on the agenda—except one, namely reunification, the commentary emphasizes.

GDR Political, Economic Reform Program Outlined

PM2311132589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 3

["Our own correspondent" S. Maslov dispatch: "Coalition Reforms"]

[Text] The GDR has entered a new stage in the process of transformations. The government crisis has ended with the formation of a new cabinet of ministers. It is new not only in composition, but also in essence. The present government is a coalition. It includes representatives of five political parties. The number of ministerial posts has been reduced from 45 to 28. For the first time in the country's history, three of them will be filled by women. Observers draw special attention to the high level of competence of the members of the present Council of Ministers. Someone has even dubbed the new cabinet "the cabinet of professors" because it includes many scientists. People are expecting competence rather than slogans from the Council of Ministers. This thought was also heard in the government statement delivered by Hans Modrow at the 12th session of the GDR People's Chamber.

A broad program of reforms has been put forward. What is its essence? The head of the government highlighted five main questions. The first is the reform of the political system which presupposes the adoption of measures to guarantee the existence of a rule-of-law state.

Economic reform is the second most important package of tasks. They feature enhancing the independence and responsibility of enterprises, reducing the role of central

leadership and planning to a sensible level, and implementing in practice the principle "from each according to his labor."

Reforms are also to be carried out in the sphere of education and management, which will mean a reduction of the state apparatus and of expenditure for its maintenance.

The government statement was approved unanimously by the People's Chamber. This does not mean, however, that complete unanimity reigned in the hall of sessions as regards approaches to the solution of overdue problems. The Liberal Democratic Party [LDPD] demanded that free elections be held as early as next year. Political parties only are to be allowed to take part in the elections, which automatically rules out the participation in them of the mass social organizations currently represented in parliament. It was announced that the LDPD will no longer stand as part of the single National Front list.

On the other hand, representatives of the Democratic Peasants' Party and the Christian Democratic Union have emphasized that they do not regard the current parliamentary session as a prologue to the election campaign.

The parliamentary National Democratic Party expressed itself in favor of a reform of the territorial-administration system. According to its viewpont, the present bezirks should be replaced by lands and free cities. With reference to the idea of the common European home, Guenter Hartmann, chairman of the National Democratic Party, spoke about the need to find new political approaches, including in relations between the two German states. He declared that it would be in keeping with the objective position of the GDR and the feelings of many of its citizens if the idea of a confederation, based on the state sovereignty of both the partners, were taken into consideration in the future. Wolfgang Herger, representing the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, gave assurances that neither the Politburo nor the Central Committee of the party would interfere in the work of the government any longer. According to the communists, the social movements on the lines of the "New Forum" which have emerged recently have a right to a place in the country's political system.

GDR New Forum Leader on Movement's Aims, Views

PM2311143189 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 47, 19 Nov 89 p 6

[Interview with Professor Jens Reich, "one of the founders of New Forum, a public movement in the GDR" by Yuriy Shpakov: "Perestroyka, Socialism, Two Germanys"; date, place not given]

[Text] [Question] One hears the most contradictory views on the aims and tasks of New Forum. I'd like to know your opinion about it.

[Answer] We set out our aims in our September 9 appeal. It was signed by 30 founders of New Forum, representatives of different strata of the republic's population, mainly intelligentsia. We have collected some 120,000 signatures and other testimonies in our support. Addressing our compatriots, we proceeded from the fact that our country has developed a deep political and economic crisis in recent months. Today the question can be posed only as: our state—to be or not to be. In this critical situation we saw our task to be to find ways to overcome people's fear, meek submissiveness, and political apathy. We wanted everyone to realize that we are the very East Germans about whose "successes and achievements" the papers have written so avidly.

On the other hand, it was necessary to take real steps to stop the unprecedented flow of refugees from the country, which is our shame and tragedy.

The former leaders of our party and state, unfortunately, proved unable to react politically to this frightening phenomenon, similar in scale to the flight of people from Germany in the 1930s. The leadership also proved to be completely helpless when faced by stagnation in the East German economy and the need to implement democratic reforms.

[Question] In the past one could often hear in the GDR this slogan "To learn from the USSR means to learn how to win!" Literally the other day I saw its modern version in one of the papers: "To learn from perestroyka means once again to learn from the USSR how to win!" How does New Forum treat the processes of renewal in the USSR?

[Answer] Unfortunately, we and our mass media have got so used to such stereotyped "wisdom" that, apparently, we cannot get rid of it all at once.

We have followed perestroyka in the USSR literally with our hearts in our mouths all this time. Now it is no secret that the truth about perestroyka was completely distorted in our mass media, or was simply ignored. A year ago the distribution of SPUTNIK was forbidden in the GDR, as were the best Soviet films of recent years.

But even at that time we learned glasnost from Soviet newspapers, radio broadcasts, literary and other magazines, and NOVOSTI Press Agency publications in German. It is clear to us in New Forum that glasnost—and we understand it not only as freedom of the press, but as freedom of speech, too—is today the most important demand in our country. It was precisely glasnost in the USSR that gave tremendous support to perestroyka's key processes. Soviet society is faced with incomparably greater tasks in reforming economic relations and in dealing with the national question. I would say that they have chosen the right direction in decentralizing the state and economic structures, experimenting in republican cost accounting, and encouraging the independence of separate regions.

Experiments and alternative solutions are also necessary in the GDR. Saxony, say, is very different from Mecklenburg or Thuringia. The colours of socialism in the GDR must be bright and must include dozens of shades. This alone will allow the citizens of our republic to identify themselves with the GDR.

[Question] How does New Forum treat the problem of the two Germanys?

[Answer] In this question we occupy a simple position—we start from the existence of one German nation, but of two German states. And we're convinced that the "German question" does exist as a real problem and that we have no right to ignore it, or to leave it to the right-wing radicals or chauvinists. For many years we never stopped to think what being a German means, including the emotional bond of our citizens to all the countries where German is spoken. To be a German also means to belong to one's own native land. The same Mecklenburg, Brandenburg or Saxony were, for many centuries, known not as Germany but as the duchy of Mecklenburg, the principality of Brandenburg, and the Kingdom of Saxony. The ties to these lands and their traditions are still alive in people, and you cannot simply forbid them. Last, the problem of one's feeling of belonging to the GDR. Today it is close to zero, especially among the young. I would like very much the new road of reforms we shall take to lead to a rebirth of this feeling.

[Question] One of the most burning issues today is the desire for all GDR citizens to travel abroad without obstacles, and to come back home without obstacles as well. Recently the draft law on leaving the country was published, but it produced a wave of dissatisfaction at once.

[Answer] For us, deep-reaching political reforms must be much more radical than our leadership thought in the beginning. Quite true, travel abroad was a painful question for us for many years. One can only be surprised how much our consciousness has been distorted and for so long with respect to this natural human requirement. In 40 years we relegated normal human inquisitiveness and curiosity into treason and treachery. If a young man wishes to see the world, he must be allowed to do so. At 17-18 years of age many people have an urge to pack their things in and visit London or Venice. We have to give our young people such an opportunity so as not to lose them altogether.

[Question] In the New Forum appeal one doesn't see the concept of "socialism" mentioned even once. At the same time you declare that you like the Soviet model of the renewal of society.

[Answer] It's not a question of terminology. In September a different meaning was imparted to the concept officially.

I think we in the GDR were far from true socialism. We must go further in our reforms. Socialism in the GDR has no alternative. People believe in it and wish to get to the point where everyone experiences his or her political and economic freedom, and can freely express themselves.

[Question] Is it possible that very soon we'll be seeing a political party called New Forum?

[Answer] We don't have any demand or political need for that. New Forum was formed as an informal public movement, as an invitation to dialogue for everyone, whatever their affiliation. We'd like to remain an informal movement in the future, too, one that is open to everyone.

Demonstration by GDR Youth League Members Noted

PM2411140989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 p 3

["Our own correspondent" S. Maslov dispatch under the rubric "Berlin on the Line": "What Is the League To Be Like?"]

[Text] The Free German Youth [FDJ] League in the GDR has found itself the target of criticism. Its members are demanding that an FDJ congress be held this December.

Many FDJ members arrived at this event not wearing the traditional blue uniform shirts. It was unusual not only in terms of its form but also in terms of its spirit. Not a meeting, nor a session, nor a debate, the FDJ demonstration took place in downtown Berlin. Its initiators were youth league members from the capital's "Bergmann-Borsig" enterprise and the FDJ organization in the Pankow District of Berlin.

Hundreds of young people complied with the organizers' appeal. Many perceived the demonstration as a farewell to the former FDJ. It was far from festive, although the rally participants applauded and paid tribute to the positive things achieved by the league under the leadership of the present Central Council headed by Eberhard Aurich. But, at the same time, one of the demonstration's watchwords was the words: "Goodbye, Eberhard!"

The assembled people demanded the holding of a congress of the youth league as early as this December. "We need a new Central Council," 10th-grader Martin Winkler declared. In addition to elections of all the FDJ's new leading organs under conditions of a secret ballot, he demanded the creation of a league of schoolchildren. Other speakers supported him. Richard Schmidt, a representative of Humboldt University, declared his lack of confidence in the present FDJ leadership. According to him, it is "failing to keep up with the development of the situation."

Eberhard Aurich did not address the rally. In a brief interview published the next day in the newspaper JUNGE WELT, the league's leader declared that he and other members of the Central Council Bureau propose to

give up their posts. The 13th FDJ Central Council Plenum, to be held 24 November, will make its decision on this question.

Meanwhile, we have learned of the creation of another youth league in the GDR. It has been named the "Left Liberal Alternative—Democratic Youth." This was reported in the newspaper DER MORGEN, the press organ of the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany.

Gorbachev Message Congratulates Ceausescu

PM2411172189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

["CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev Greets Romanian Communist Party's Ceausescu on Reelection"]

[Text] To Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP]

Esteemed Comrade Ceausescu!

Accept my congratulations on your reelection to the post of general secretary of the RCP.

In connection with the closure of the 14th RCP Congress, I wish Romania's Communists successes in resolving the tasks of the Socialist Republic of Romania's socioeconomic development, and I wish peace and well-being for the Romanian people.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

1990 Trade Agreement With Romania Signed

PM2311150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Signing of Protocol"]

[Text] A protocol on USSR-Romanian trade and payments for 1990 was signed in Moscow 16 November.

The document envisages deliveries from Romania of considerable quantities of sewn and knitted goods, leather, rubber, and sports footwear, furniture, medicines, foodstuffs, commodities for housing construction, machinery, equipment, and chemical goods.

In payment for the goods received from Romania, the Soviet Union will supply increasing amounts of machinery and equipment, traditional raw material goods, including goods produced by enterprises constructed on the USSR's territory with Romanian participation within the framework of integration agreements.

Deliveries of goods within the framework of direct contractual ties between USSR enterprises, regions, and republics and Romanian foreign trade enterprises will be developed further.

BCP Working Toward 'Open, Honest Dialogue'

PM2311104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Zhmyrev: "For Frank Dialogue"]

[Text] Sofia, 21 Nov—In the past 10 days events have taken place in Bulgaria which in terms of their scale and dynamism could fill whole months and perhaps even years. The party has steered a new course in its development and the development of the country, receiving mass support from the entire Bulgarian people.

These words were uttered by Petur Mladenov, the new general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, at a meeting with workers of Sofia's "Sredets" [name as transliterated] plant. The Bulgarian mass media are noting that the course steered by the BCP toward open, honest dialogue with the people has been backed up by meetings between working people and party and government leaders and rallies of many thousands in Sofia, Ruse, Burgas, Plovdiv, Vratsa, and other cities.

On Monday a routine session of the BCP Central Committee Politburo was held. It noted that a number of proposals put forward at the rallies of many thousands, in particular concerning the democratization of the solution of existing problems, are an objective basis for further dialogue with people and for rallying society for the sake of socialism. Here it is absolutely essential to observe civilized norms of dialogue, culture, and ethics and a sense of responsibility during political debates and discussions in order to overcome some extremist tendencies that have been manifested in recent days. They can only complicate the perestroyka process. These manifestations cannot be left without an appropriate political reaction. But there can be no question of regressing to the pernicious methods and means rejected by the BCP

BCP Politburo Meeting Discusses Renewal Process

PM2211122989 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 3

[TASS report: "Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo Session"]

[Text] Sofia, 21 Nov—The situation in the country following the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee plenum held 16 November 1989 and the Bulgarian National Assembly session has been examined at a BCP Central Committee Politburo session. It was pointed out that the decisions of the Central Committee and parliament meet with approval in all sections of Bulgarian society, which attests to a new political situation taking shape in the country. Nationwide support for the radical changes being implemented is viewed as a decisive precondition for deepening and dynamizing the restructuring and renewal of society in keeping with the people's socialist choice.

It was emphasized that it requires the mobilization of everyone's forces and ability and the whole people's participation to resolve the tasks facing the country. The responsibility of Communists and party organizations, which must act with initiative and vigor, surmounting all obstacles, is particularly great.

The Politburo believes that a number of the proposals made at public rallies 17 and 18 November this year constitute a basis for continuing the dialogue and rallying society in the name of the renewal of socialism. At the same time, it was pointed out that certain extremist trends that have been manifested might hamper the restructuring process. Attempts to use public addresses, television, and other mass media to put extreme demands that run counter to the constitutional system and the basic values and principles of socialism must not be left without an appropriate political assessment. But at the same time, there can be no question of the flawed methods and means rejected by the November (1989) plenums of the BCP Central Committee. It is absolutely essential to observe the civilized norms of dialogue, culture, and ethics and to show a sense of responsibility in political debates.

The Politburo outlined specific measures to realize the decisions of the BCP Central Committee November (1989) plenums. Central Committee November Plenum, the Politburo session noted.

Bulgaria's Todorov, Mladenov View Developments

PM2211213189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Kapralov dispatch: "Time For Action"]

[Text] Sofia—"We support the renewal process", "Freedom, perestroyka, democracy!", "Enough talk, we want action", "Glasnost now!" These are the slogans being used in the continuing mass demonstrations in Bulgaria.

Speaking in the town of Vratsa, S. Todorov, chairman of the People's Assembly, noted that over the past few years a great deal was said about perestroyka and glasnost, but everything remained the way it had been in the past. The administrative-edict system was not destroyed. The "cult and the regime of cults" [kult i kultovshchina] stifled any attempt at change. Answering numerous questions, he reported that a Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee plenum would soon be held, and it would tell the whole truth about Bulgaria's development over the past 30 years. This truth may be largely a bitter truth.

Today the party has set its sights on basing relations with the people not on the unquestioning fulfillment of contradictory instructions but on dialogue in which each person's voice can be heard. This was shown yet again by the meetings between members of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Sofia's labor collectives. They were distinguished by their frankness, businesslike nature, free expression of opinions, and mutual trust.

Over the past 10 days in Bulgaria, P. Mladenov said, addressing workers at the "Sredets" Plant, there have been events which could fill whole months, if not years, in terms of their scale and dynamism. The most typical feature of these 10 days has been that we are receiving massive spontaneous support from the entire people.

At the same time, as was noted at the Central Committee Politburo session, certain extremist trends that have been evident in the past few days could complicate the perestroyka process. Attempts to use public forums, television, and the other mass media to put forward extreme demands which run counter to the Constitution and to basic socialist values and principles should not pass without an appropriate political assessment. There can be no question of a return to rejected methods and means.

The scale and nature of the problems to be resolved requires stability, calm, and consideration for vital national interests. It is absolutely necessary to adhere to civilized norms of dialogue, culture, ethics, and a sense of responsibility in political discussions.

The main thing now, the Politburo session noted, is to create an atmosphere for conscientious work and to show discipline and organization at all workplaces.

BCP's Mladenov Stresses Need for Reforms

PM2211213589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Need For Change"]

[Text] Sofia, 22 Nov—The need to radically change the party's approach to the problems of socioeconomic life has been stressed by Petur Mladenov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council. He was speaking at a meeting held here with the capital's party organization aktiv.

The Bulgarian leader dwelt on the reasons for the complex situation in the country, which has led to the decisions of the BCP Central Committee plenums held this November. He defined the main avenues of the party's adopted course of perestroyka and indicated the BCP's tasks under the conditions of the expansion of democratization and glasnost, on whose resolution the strengthening of the party's leading role depends.

In their speeches the meeting participants made an objective assessment of the profound changes entering the country's life and of certain negative phenomena in Bulgarian society. Particular attention was devoted to the tasks facing Communists in the capital and throughout the country in light of the decisions of the BCP Central Committee November plenums.

Supreme Soviet Greetings to Bulgaria's Mladenov

PM2211123189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Greeting to Bulgaria's Petur Mladenov"]

[Text] To Comrade Petur Mladenov, chairman of the Bulgarian State Council

Dear Comrade Mladenov!

Please accept our cordial congratulations on your election as chairman of the Bulgarian State Council.

We express the certainty that Soviet-Bulgarian friendship and comprehensive cooperation will reliably serve the interests of our fraternal peoples.

We wish you great successes in the radical renewal of Bulgarian society and in strengthening socialist Bulgaria's prestige and authority in the world.

[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Hungarian Poll Seen as Opposition Maneuvering

PM2411180589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "On Eve of the Referendum"]

[Text] Budapest, 24 Nov—A referendum of fundamental importance will be held throughout Hungary 26 November, for the first question to be answered will be whether the president should be chosen before or after the parliamentary elections.

The referendum has been forced on the country by the Union of Free Democrats. This union is trying to ensure that the president is chosen by parliament, whose composition the opposition parties will try to "fabricate" to their own liking at the general elections. Their aim is obvious: to erect obstacles for I. Pozsgay, the current presidential candidate from the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP]. Obviously, if direct presidential elections are held before the parliamentary elections, Pozsgay will have a considerably greater chance of winning the post.

The Union of Free Democrats' "little tricks" also extend to the fact that this referendum question has been "overshadowed" by three other questions that have already been decided by the Hungarian State Assembly. These are the questions of disbanding the workers militia, of banning party organizations at enterprises, and of the fate of party property.

The referendum idea has been supported by the Union of Free Democrats, the Smallholders' Party, and the Social-Democratic Party.

At the same time, such a prestigious party as the Hungarian Democratic Forum has called for a boycott of the referendum.

In its slogans the MSZP proposes answering "no" to the first question and "yes" to the three others. A number of parties share this MSZP position—the people should elect the president first and the parliament second.

The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, which is currently holding organizational meetings in preparation for its 14th Congress, has appealed to the people to answer "no" to all four questions.

With such divergent opinions, I think Sunday's vote will be difficult. And will not the 200 million forints spent on organizing the referendum be money wasted?

Protest Movements in East Europe Viewed

LD2411121989 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Commentary by Georgiy Gramatchikov]

[Text] The events in Eastern Europe are in the focus of the attention of the mass media around the world. Here is a commentary by Georgiy Gramatchikov.

The events in the GDR, Poland, and Hungary have marked the start of profound social change. Yugoslavia has been trying for some time to find a way out of the present crisis. The events in these countries have much in common and they followed roughly the same scenario.

At first it appears that all is peace and quiet. The leaders assure the public they are certain that their policy is right and that the people support it. Later on protests are heard. Attempts are made to turn a blind eye to them or to charge those who voice them with various faults. The number of protestors begins to grow rapidly and they begin to take to the streets. The police are sent in to deal with them, and it is proclaimed that the crowds in the streets are incited by antisocialist elements hostile to the people.

Nevertheless, the number of protestors keeps on growing, to a point when it becomes clear that they cannot be against the people because they are the people. Tension keeps on growing until it reaches a culmination. The authorities face the dilemma of either acknowledging (?that) public demands are correct, or leaving the political scene. In some cases, however, even without the culmination it becomes clear that the leadership must be changed.

In the spring, writes Gramatchikov, I travelled to Bulgaria where I (?talked) [words indistinct]. I could feel that they were eagerly awaiting change in real terms. They asked me what provisions the Soviet Union made to rotate its leaders, what was done to remove privileges and whether it was true that Soviet enterprises were given independence.

These public sentiments were in stark contrast with the complacent atmosphere at the luxurious [word indistinct] of party leaders of the small town who received

them. The chain reaction of events in Eastern Europe was generated by the need for profound social change which is long overdue.

Significantly, the people calling for a cardinal renewal do not reject the socialist choice out of hand. They merely reinterpret that notion and understand socialism as a truly democratic society of really free people who are free to voice their thoughts, travel as they please, and earn as much as their work is worth.

In conclusion, I would like to turn to one more socialist country where an important event is taking place as well. I mean Romania, where the 14th Congress of the Communist Party began. A report on national television in this country showed the opening ceremony. The audience burst into stormy applause as Nicolae Ceausescu, the leader of the party and state, appeared on the rostrum. The applause went on and on and the audience chanted: Glory to Ceausescu, the hero of heroes, glory to the architect of Socialist Romania and the genius of our time. This was happening in November 1989.

Military Observer on East European Processes

PM2411130989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin "Observer's Notes": "Forecasts Must Be Well-Considered"]

[Text] East Europe. Strictly speaking, this term does not exist geographically. In the political sense, it comprises the USSR's Warsaw Pact allies. Time has reinforced in people's consciousness a kind of generalized idea of these countries as loyal partners that always support one another in everything. This notion has become so ingrained that we seem to know in advance what newspapers will tell us about our friends' way of life. The eye would glide over the appropriate areas of newsprint without exertion, trying to find from the headlines some printed matter that would excite the imagination, prompt doubts, and arouse indignation.

Now everything has taken a different turn...Poland, Hungary, the GDR, Bulgaria...the rapidity, dissimilarity, and drama of the changes taking place in these states have been such that they have attracted most close attention from the entire thinking world. The essence of the changes is the deepening of democracy and political and spiritual renewal. The common principles uniting the processes in the East European countries and perestroyka in the Soviet Union do not give rise to doubt. The events taking place before our eyes—ranging from the opposition coming to power in Poland to the Germans' impressive "fraternization" in the center of Europe, on the line where the two blocs come into contact—would hardly have occurred without perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

Does all this mean that the aforementioned changes are of a subjective nature? That, for instance, Moscow has "organized" the retirement of T. Zhivkov and E. Honecker? Yet it is this interpretation of events that some people in the West are trying to foist on public opinion. It must be noted with utter clarity that such opinions are founded on a superficial, vulgar interpretation of the perestroyka processes in socialist countries and sometimes are simply born of a dogged refusal to renounce the prejudices of the past "cold war" era.

In principle those people who, overcome by the urge to make forecasts, are trying to depict the "disintegration" of the Warsaw Pact as soon as possible also demonstrate a similar way of thinking. The authors of these forecasts do not take the trouble to cite any serious arguments, confining themselves to expounding purely personal suppositions regarding a particular country's likely steps. At the same time, the positions of the governments of the Warsaw Pact's sovereign states have been expounded clearly and unequivocally. There are not even any hints of a possible change of attitude to their participation in the alliance. A number of contradictory opinions can be cited on this score, providing firm confirmation of adherence to alliance commitments.

Here is just one, a quite recent statement by GDR leader E. Krenz: "We are situated in an extremely sensitive area of Europe, where socialism and capitalism meet, while NATO and the Warsaw Pact confront one another. That is why it is important to maintain stability here. We are convinced that our allies lie in the East and we will always fulfill our commitments as members of the Warsaw Pact."

Actually, in the West, too, official circles' positions are formulated on the basis of the interests of preserving stability on the European Continent. They are far from implying any actions aimed at "spurring on the disintegration" of the Warsaw Pact, to use M. Thatcher's expression. It must be noted that herein resides the realism and foresight of Western politicians.

At the same time, both East and West are studying with increasing thoroughness the question of fundamental changes in the character of both blocs and their politicization in accordance with a reduction in the level of military confrontation. But whereas in the West this view of NATO's future development is mainly expressed by representatives of nongovernmental organizations, in the East the idea of transforming the Warsaw Pact from a military-political into a political-military alliance is certainly a most official one. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact countries have also advocated the complete disbandment of both alliances on a reciprocal basis.

Predictions founded on clearly ill-advised assessments concerning the prospects for GDR-FRG relations, which are for some reason circulated without any circumspection, also obviously merit a special attitude. Some people have seen the GDR Government's decision to open up the border for everyone who wishes to visit the FRG or to move there outright as the prelude to the two German states' reunification. This allegedly is already guaranteed

but has been postponed for the time being by the Soviet military presence in the GDR—perhaps for 1 year, perhaps for less. Further prospects are also described—including the active use by the newly-formed German colossus of rich Russian resources, admittedly with Moscow's permission. Unless, of course, "Communist imperialists" full of determination to prove the strength of Russian Communism with weapons in hand are sitting in Gorbachev's seat by then.

One wonders if it worth getting so excited about forecasts? No, it is not, Britain's Foreign Secretary D. Hurd said. According to the newspaper THE INDEPENDENT, the minister described the opening of the wall as an historic event, however he immediately poured cold water on those who frivolously believe the reunification of the two German states or an unexpected change in the role of the two military alliances are possible.

Other well-known politicians are also in agreement with the high-ranking Briton. Thus, W. Brandt and H.-D. Genscher only see the possibility of the Germans achieving "national unity" within the framework of the all-European process. French Defense Minister J.-P. Chevenement not without grounds sees in accelerated reunification the danger of violating the "geostrategic equilibrium." Meanwhile, an editorial article in THE NEW YORK TIMES only sees unification in the remote future, underlining that "neither the Europeans, the Russians, the Americans, nor the Germans themselves are prepared or willing to witness the birth of a fourth reich."

I think that these opinions are nearer the truth. Behind them is understanding of the adverse consequences of a break as a result of which it is not altogether impossible that we may see hitherto unknown problems and contradictions that are now lying in a state of lethargy in a relatively stable situation.

Realism and well-considered assessments thus seem to be the imperative of the current historical moment in the development of the European situation. For, assessments are invariably followed by decisions and decisions by actions.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet on Language, Nationality Bills

PM2311131189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA Parliamentary Group S. Pastukhov, Ye. Sorokin, and Yu. Ursov report from the Kremlin: "Agreement Among Themselves"]

[Text] Language, as is well known, is the soul of a people, its past, present, and future. Without a common language people from the same nation cannot agree among themselves about joint labor, leisure, love, or ultimately even talk to one another. But what happens if people of different nations and different people living under the same state roof and united solely by a common sociopolitical idea have to agree among themselves on all these matters? In that case about the kind of people should they be, how they are to communicate with one another, to be friends, and to develop? In other words, h they should use their native language, the common st language? What are the prospects here?

This matter was discussed at the session of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities in the Kremlin yesterday [15 November] which examined the draft law on the languages of the USSR peoples and the draft law on the free national development of citizens living outside their own national state formations, or who do not have such a formation, on the territory of the USSR.

Scientists, local and republic soviets, and USSR people's deputies have taken part in elaborating the two interconnected draft laws, R.N. Nishanov, who chaired the session, reported. Their task was not easy: Many republics have already adopted language status laws, and this has led to an increase in political tension in some republics. The main aim to which the text of the draft law on languages is directed, as Ch. Aytmatov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of the Historical Heritage, said when presenting it on the commission's behalf, is to seek compromises between extreme viewpoints.

The debate on the first item on the agenda of the Soviet of Nationalities session has gone on too long, R.N. Nishanov said, leaving no time to discuss the second draft law. The members of the chamber voted to submit the draft law on the languages of the USSR peoples to the scrutiny of the session in the light of the amendments and suggestions made.

After the recess the seats in the auditorium were occupied by members of the Soviet of the Union, who were due to discuss the draft Law on amendments and additions to the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship." The reports on this question were delivered by K. Lubenchenko, deputy chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, and B. Katorgin, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium commission on citizenship questions. They noted the great importance of the draft law, which is fundamentally different from the existing law. It is essentially a new law—a democratic one which takes international practice into account. Deputies N. Tutov, A. Sobchak, S. Akhromeyev, Yu. Boyars, and others spoke in the debate. The Soviet of the Union presented the document for discussion by the evening plenary session. The Soviet of the Union session was conducted by its chairman, Ye.M. Primakov.

The two draft laws previously discussed separately in the chambers, and the draft law "On the Free National Development of USSR Citizens Living Outside Their Own National State Formations or Who Do Not Have Such a Formation on the Territory of the USSR" were presented for discussion to the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities chaired by A.I. Lukyanov.

A number of deputies expressed their thoughts on the document concepts, which are essentially fundamental articles. One suggestion—to follow precedent and prepare the drafts for publication in all their variant forms—received general approval.

The Supreme Soviet adopted resolutions to approve these draft laws at the first reading and send them for further work.

The next joint session opens on 20 November.

Primakov Chairs 22 Nov Supreme Soviet Commission

LD2411111689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Chaired by Comrade Primakov, a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission on the priveleges enjoyed by certain categories of citizens, was held on 22 November. It heard a report from Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. It was noted with satisfaction that in accordance with previous recommendations by the commission, the USSR Council of Ministers had adopted a number of decisions. Thus, on the basis of a government order dated 31 August, the children's establishments, clinics, and sanatoria under the control of the Fourth Main Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Health have been handed over for general use. It was noted in particular that the material provisions, the system of payment for the labor of workers, and the calculated norms for expenditure on catering and medical supplies existing at the time of transfer have been maintained in the establishments that have been handed over. The USSR Council of Ministers recommended the councils of ministers of the union republics to take similar measures.

The commissions' recommendation that the Fourth Main Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Health be abolished was accepted for implementation. By an order of the USSR Council of Ministers, dated 12 October, some medical and sanatorium establishments are being transferred to the control of the USSR Ministry of Health for their subsequent use as treatment and rehabilitation centers for children, invalids, and war and labor veterans. A special commission has been set up to complete all the organizational measures connected with the abolition of the Fourth Main Directorate. It is due to complete work not later than 1 January 1990.

The USSR Supreme Soviet commission on priveleges has started considering matters connected with instituting order in the use of official road transport. The commission is continuing its work.

Salykov Urges 'Practical Action' on Environment

LD2411121289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1719 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Speech by Kakimbek Salykov, chairman of the Committee for Ecology and the Rational Use of National Resources at the 23 November USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Excerpts] The proportion of financing for environmental protection measures should be increased to 3 percent of the gross national product. However, doubling funds will yield nothing if we do not reinforce this with the necessary material resources through the state order. The attitude toward the fulfillment of laws in force and decisions adopted should be changed. Here serious omissions and errors are being permitted. The allocated capital investment, which we consider to be extremely small, is only being assimilated by 50 percent.

The number of cases of accidental pollution of the environment is increasing, sometimes leading to human casualties. In 103 towns, with a total population of 50 million people, the maximum permitted concentration of harmful substances in the atmosphere is being exceeded by a factor of 10 or more. In many towns a significant proportion of pollution is due to road traffic. The ecological catastrophes of Chernobyl and Uralsk Oblast are common knowledge. The Ladoga, the Volga Valley, the Baykal and the Baltic, Azov, Black and Caspian seas are in a state of precrisis. The situation is being exacerbated in Kalmykiya, the southern Urals, in southern Ukriane, in Donbass, Kuzbas, in eastern Kazakhstan, in the Sevan and Balkash, Issykul and Amur areas, and the basins of other rivers. This situation has, above, all, been caused by the backwardness in ecological culture and by the irresponsiblity of many ministeries and departments in environmental matters, and also by the poor exactingness of the government of the country, of the leading bodies of the union and autonomous republics.

Many leaders are promising that they will go green, but they are so slow in going green that so far one has to become red before society and the people. Everyone knows that a national ecological program, a draft law on environmental protection in the USSR, and a map of the environmental situation of the country are being composed. It is proposed implementing a program for organization, economic, production, scientific, and practical measures. Ecological standards are being refined. However, the deadlines for the preparation of the program of the law are being impermissibly drawn out. New deadlines are being established in draft decisions. It is also necessary to speed up the creation of a state information system, including by means of space monitoring elements with the aim of permanent supervision of the environment. All these and other long-term measures are the ones that the committee has in mind. But the draft decision submitted to you is, above all, aimed at preventing the threat of irrevocable changes, at elaborating plans for actions to eliminate the dangerous enviromental phenomena that are already here, and unfavorable circumstances which have a direct effect upon deterioration in the state of the environment surrounding people's lives and health.

The USSR Supreme Soviet decision on such a topical issue should help to step up the environmental action being taken by the country's government, and local Soviet and economic bodies at all levels. We hope that the trade unions, the Komsomol, and all public independently run organizations will make their own substantial contribution to the cause of rational utilization of nature. The draft contains certain points that appear strategic, yet nevertheless, comrades, the strategy also has to be accelerated in order to get urgent practical action underway. Thus, to take exhaustive measures to clear up the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station accident, while attaching priority significance to the republic state programs, we believe that a common union-republican program should be created and given legal force so as to allow priority decisions, both on financial and on material-technical matters. We believe that the government commission, headed by Comrade Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of ministers, should be a permanent commission.

Many comrades, including USSR people's deputies, are inclined to think that all the solutions have been found and the necessary resources earmarked for the problems of intense desertification in the Aral region. This is far from correct. Our generation is witnessing the death of an entire sea; the land, the air, the water, and people have become sick. As yet, only the minimum is being done, without which it would be impossible to keep the Aral region alive, especially in Karakalpakia. For a complete solution to the region's ecological problems the Aral Sea must be restored as the main climate-forming body of the overall ecosystem. There is still no scientific concept of how this is to be achieved, and this is precisely the task set by the draft decision under discussion. It's not a simple issue.

The Soviet public has rejected the plan to divert some of the water from the Siberian rivers to Central Asia. Some

scientists propose redistributing the water of the Caspian Sea, the level of which is rising. There is a growing and justified demand for a dramatic cutback in cotton sowing. There are projects for the partial melting of glaciers, and practical attempts are being made to increase rainfall in the Aral Sea basin. All these proposals have to be weighed up and considered. There are even foreign firms offering their services on this matter. We must make use of the opportunities presented by the United Nations Environment Program programs. We are obliged by all means possible, as they say, to create a conceptual program for the restoration of the Aral Sea and the stabilization of the ecosystem in that expansive region. We believe that this work should be carried out by a permanent government commission.

The issue of the Semipalatinsk nuclear weapons test site has turned into a crisis. Apart from satisfying the population's demands for an end to nuclear weapons testing as stated in the draft decision, there must be a clear-cut program for rendering assistance to inhabitants of the region who have suffered from the consequences of the tests. We are receiving appeals from people's deputies from various regions of the country in which ammunition is being destroyed, and nuclear or chemical waste is being buried or destroyed. The ministry of Defense must take note of these warnings and reach the appropriate conclusions. [passage omitted]

Ill-considered and, from the environmental point of view, unjustified application of chemicals, is causing a great deal of suffering. The use of pesticides, dioxins, and similar products is becoming an acute issue. The total annual application of pesticides in areas of Krasnodar Kray, Sverdlovsk Oblast, Tajikistan, Kirgizia, Armenia, and Turkmenia is five or more times the average for the country. In areas of maximum pesticide application the child disease rate is far above the national indices. According to figures from the Scientific Research Institute for Hygiene and Disease Prevention Among Children and Adolescents, no more than 20 percent of the country's schoolchildren are absolutely healthy. The incidence of allergies, infections, and other diseases has increased, particularly in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.

People's Deputy Comrade Burykh was right to raise the issue of the need to resettle people living within ecologically hazardous zones. There has been much talk on this subject, but it is time to adopt the most urgent and practical measures. We believe that direct responsibility here should be borne by local state and economic bodies, and indeed, some thinking on this needs to be done by the national and union repubican governments.

A considerable amount of harm is done by domestic chemicals, which are responsible for thousands of deaths each year. We are convinced that a law is needed to regulate the production and retailing of chemical products.

A tough situation is developing concerning fresh water in the country; two thirds of our water sources are not up to sanitary standards. Six hundred of the country's towns are not provided with good quality purification of effluent. The draft resolution proposes solving the task of supplying the country's population with high-quality drinking water when drawing up a long-term program. This, of course, is a complex issue, but it is impossible to go on living this way. Local bodies have a special role to play in tackling this problem, with the help, of course, of the USSR Gosplan and the gosplans of the union and autonomous republics. [passage omitted]

Vyucheyskiy Describes 2d Nuclear Test Site

LD2411103689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1823 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy A.I. Vyucheyskiy at the 23 November USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I am Deputy Vyucheyskiy, from the word vyuchit [to learn]. So, I had a conversation with Comrade Salykov and he is speaking from this rostrum for the second time and is speaking only about the existence of one test site, the one at Semipalatinsk. When I told him that there was a test site at Novaya Zemlya, he asked me what this was and where it was. So here I am explaining that a second test site exists on Novaya Zemlya Island, in the Arctic Ocean. The islands are divided by the Barents and Kara Seas. Exactly, the same difficult setting exists here as in Semipalatinsk. For this reason, the inhabitants of our okrug are very concerned about the fact that one-sided information today comes from the mass media only on the test site of Semipalatinsk. For this reason, our inhabitants have collected more than 5,000 signatures and have sent a letter to you, as an appeal. The USSR Supreme Soviet, USSR people's deputies, we inhabiants of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug, very close neighbors of the nuclear test site on Novaya Zemlya Island, are making this appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Thirty-three years ago, Novaya Zemlya Island was torn away from its indigenous inhabitants, the Nenets people, by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers without taking into consideration the opinion of the peoples. Since then, it has been considered outside the jurisdiction of Arkhangelsk Oblast, and information about it, apart from TASS reports on the conduct of nuclear tests aimed at improving military technology, has not been revealed.

We ask the Supreme Soviet: Who in our country owns the land, including Novaya Zemlya, and determines the right to use the land? Is the apportionment of lands by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, without taking into consideration the opinion of the indigenous population, legal?

We welcome the initiatives of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the north

and support the international movement for a nuclear-free European north. The report on the possible transfer of nuclear tests from the Semipalatinsk region to Novaya Zemlya was all the more startling for us. We consider that such a step would inflict a blow to the peace initiatives of the Soviet leadership and would inevitably lead the country to a confrontation with the international movement.

We express the categoric demand: Nuclear tests in the north must cease. We propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet listen without delay to the military leadership on the issues of transferring tests and plans for conducting them and that it compare the military advantage with the political, economic, and social damage that this step will provoke. We propose that a law on the ecological protection of the population on the whole territory of the USSR be quickly prepared, examined, and adopted. Not one enterprise, whether civilian or military, should function until all measures of protection are adopted and security is guaranteed.

The ecological consequences of the transfer of the tests to the Arctic are unknown. It is only evident that the ecological balance of the European north will be disturbed. A real threat arises that in the near future we will create another ecological disaster zone. We believe that the time has come to speak the truth about this. We propose and insist that an immediate inspection of Novaya Zemlya be organized under the aegis of the World Health Organisation. Physicists, ecologists, physicians, USSR People's deputies, representatives of the okrug, and journalists put forward by the population itself should make up the inspectorate. The inspectorate, having objectively considered the influence of the test site on changes in the ecological setting in the European north, and having considered the plans for conducting tests for the next few years, must give conclusions on the permissability of work at the site in general. Right up to the publication of the results of the inspection of work at the site, work at the site should be ceased.

We insist on an immediate referendum among the population of the European north on the issue of the very existence of the nuclear test site at Novaya Zemlya. We consider that state interests are above all expressed by opinion common to the whole people and only then by departmental ones. Thirty-three years of nuclear tests could not help but affect the state of health of the people of the Nenets Autonomous Okrug. The number of oncological illnesses is growing. We consider it essential that a special preventative program and children's protection program be elaborated, that a universal and complete health system by provided for the population of the okrug, and that contemporary diagnostic centers be developed for this—permanent centers in the town of (?Naryan Mar) and not less than two mobile ones—and that the necessary equipment and other resources be sought.

One of the main types of economic activity of the okrug is reindeer breeding. Berries are the reindeers' main food and berries are characterized by a high accumulation of radionuclides. The primary products—meat and milk—may become dangerous. Both the population's occupation and its very existence are under threat. We consider it essential that a radiation surveillance service be set up in the okrug no later than March 1990, and that daily measurements over the whole area be imposed as a duty.

The results of the dosimetric monitoring should be published daily in the local press. If there is radioactive pollution of products, their immediate withdrawal and the complete provision of the okrug at the expense of deliveries should be guaranteed. The responsibility for the implementation of these measures should be laid on the USSR Council of Ministers. We understand that only radical measures can ensure the security of the peoples of the north and of the planet as a whole. The imminent conclusion of a treaty on the full cessation of nuclear testing for all time—with this aim we propose that a moratorium be declared immediately on all types of tests right up to the conclusion of the treaty, that all peoples, governments, and states posessing nuclear weapons be addressed with the proposal, that they speed up work on the attainment of accords so that a treaty may be signed and ratified by 1990.

Taking this appeal of the inhabitants of our okrug into account I propose that at point 5 of the decision where it says that the USSR Ministry of Defense and the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power generation and Nuclear Industry are to thoroughly consider the issue of the cessation of nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk test site and submit the proposal to the USSR Council of Ministers, I propose that the phrase at the Semipalatinsk and at the Novaya Zemlya test site be inserted.

Moscow TV Relays 24 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings

1600 GMT

LD2411175489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 24 November begins carrying a recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

At 1603 GMT Gorbachev asks deputies to register their attendance and then opens the session. Gorbachev says: "Good, we can work. I declare the sitting of the Supreme Soviet open. A couple of words on the order of speeches. We, comrades, are starting to examine the question of the draft law on the economic independence of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian Union Republics. As you remember at the first session we discussed this question in July, I repeat, at the first session. Then the draft law was approved in its first reading and entrusted to the appropriate committees and commissions to finish work on it. Such work was carried out. Recently a group of USSR People's Deputies from the Baltic Republics presented a new varient of the USSR draft law which you also have in your hands. Yesterday the

appropriate committees and commissions, with the participation of USSR People's Deputies from the Baltic Republics and representatives of the USSR Council of Ministers, carefully examined all the materials and proposals on this question. As a result a draft law has been prepared, on the basis of the one adopted at its first reading. This has also been given out to you in such a form—a comparison where the clauses, so to speak, are given. I now hand over, to report on this question, to Comrade Vologzhin, Valentin Mikhaylovich, chairman of the Committee on Economic Reforms."

Vologzhin begins to speak at 1605 GMT. He recalls the presentation of a further draft bill by Baltic deputies. The commission of the Soviet of Nationalities and others have considered this. It was deemed expedient to continue discussing the draft earlier given its first reading. The draft bill which results from the hard work done by the committees and commissions is now presented for its second reading. The text is in your hands. Vologzhin outlines how the texts of the different versions are set out in the documents the deputies have received. He draws attention to specific amendments and additions.

Vologzhin continues to cite individual points and sections of points to which alterations have been made. One of these concerns the management of commercial functions and the work of banks aimed at preserving the integrity of the country's monetary and financial system.

At 1614 GMT Vologzhin turns to point 5, Article 1 and compares different proposed wordings. In point 6 a change in wording is mentioned. He goes on to mention other changes and additions in the wording of individual points and articles, referring to the texts in the hands of the deputies and the way in which the changes are set out on those copies. Sections of some articles have been moved and incorporated into other ones.

At 1622 GMT Vologzhin ends his speech, saying that the committee on economic reform recommends that the bill be adopted in its second reading.

Gorbachev invites Comrade Kalmykov to take the floor. Kalmykov opens his address. The first draft of the bill was deficient. We must not put a brake on the economic independence of the republics. Kalmykov speaks of specific changes made to the bill and recommends its acceptance. He speaks about the importance of the federation. The union determines the fundamentals while the republics determine the details of their implementation. The republics develop the fundamentals that have been worked out on an all-union basis.

At 1629 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Vilkas to take the floor.

Vilkas, from Lithuania, says that the commission he chairs, the Council of Nationalities Commission for Social and Economic Development of Constituent and Autonomous Regions and Territories, approved it almost unanimously and recommends its acceptance. One person opposed it because its effect was to introduce certain laws in the republics earlier than in others. We also noted that we support the most liberal version: Giving the republics the greatest possible freedom is the best thing we can do for them. For the whole union's sake it is essential that someone should have the responsibility for acquiring experience which will be of value to all: this is what the Baltic republics will be doing.

At 1633 GMT Gorbachev invites Comrade Valov from Kirov Oblast to take the floor. Valov speaks of the desire of the Baltic republics to deepen perestroyka and discover nonstandard solutions. However, he goes on to outline in broad terms the work that has been done on the bill over the past few days which has led to the bill becoming more radical. The draft bill deals intimately with the country's economic system. Certain articles of the draft bill run counter to what is stated in the Constitution. Granting the Baltic republics exclusive rights virtually amounts to rescinding economic control. Individual articles in the draft bill, furthermore, are contradictory. The draft bill runs counter to the principles of running the economy of a federative state. He introduces a number of proposed changes and concludes by saying that if these changes are accepted he would be prepared to see it given a second reading.

1639 GMT

LD2411204689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1639 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev introduces Deputy Prunskene from Lithuania who begins to address the session Prunskene speaks about her concept of federalism and the delegation of powers from the center to the republics. The federation unites the people, she says. Deformations have to be removed. She talks about ecological problems that are best solved locally rather than at the center. Differences in realities simply cannot be seen from the center she says. Prunskiene regrets that the bill has been changed in the past few days. She regrets preambles added upon the insistence of members of the government.

Prunskene continues to speak about individual amendments to the bill. She asks for certain points to be defined further, referring to them by point and article numbers. She proposes alternative wording for one of the articles. She ends by rejecting criticisms that the republics want to set up command and bureaucratic systems.

At 1648 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Pupkevich from Estonia to take the floor. Pupkevich begins to speak and notes certain shortcomings he sees in the draft bill. Part of its runs counter to Article 74 of the Constitution allowing for discrimination against minorities during elections. He goes on to speak about other provisions in the bill which he finds unacceptable. We have an impossible situation in which some people live according to the

law of the union while others live according to the law of a republic. Pupkevich says that the bill can be accepted, once it has undergone substantial further work: It cannot be accepted as it stands.

At 1655 GMT Deputy Sharin from Amur Oblast is invited to the floor by Gorbachev. He says the deputies are in a difficult situation. The law we are considering today is very different from the one discussed earlier. There are blank spots in the laws being presented now because we have not listened to the deputy who told us that we cannot build a house if we start with the roof. He believes that to adopt this law today would be premature without the prior adoption of other laws laying down basic principles. He proposes that the law should not be adopted.

At 1700 GMT there is a 15-minute interval in the televised recording.

At 1715 GMT the recording resumes with Gorbachev inviting Deputy Bresis from Latvia to take the floor.

Bresis says many peopl are no doubt asking what it is that the Baltic republics want? We want equal opportunities for all, which can only be achieved if responsibility is shifted from central, union, bodies to the localities. There are two ways to improve the economy: Do it all to one model, or, alternatively, for each republic to do its own thing. It would be possible to move foward on a centralized basis—but the results would not be achieved. He speaks about the valuable traditions accumulated over the years by each republic: Each people has the right to use its own economic potential. Our common development and prosperity is impossible without the development and prosperity of all. Latvia does not have valuable raw-materials, but it has other features that are of value. We want a new economic model to expand cooperation between the components parts of the federation. The main thing is the ownership of land and minerals. Which comes first: The republics or the union of republics? Let's retain the version of this bill adopted yesterday by the coordinating commission, Bresis says, and then goes on to quote from a statistical report of the Latvian statistical directorate. He speaks about banks and the budget. New budget formation systems are needed. In conclusion, Bresis asks whether one can have a cardinal economic reform without changing the mechanisms? Certainly not, Bresis replies. Let us not be afraid of carrying out experiments. It's an experiment that affects only a tiny part of the economy of the Union. Let us carry it out, he urges.

At 1723 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Danilyuk to take the floor. Danilyuk begins to speak. He is in favour of independence, of initiative on the part of the deputies and peoples of the Baltic republics. But before I determined my position, he says, I attended the commission on the economic reform where I listened to what was said by the Baltic representatives and heard what was said by the economists and academics. I concluded that what we are talking about is not the need for independence but a further step toward winning the right to leave the federation—and to do so by paying a very low price for the privilege, he adds.

All Soviet people are worried about the role of the party. Direct threats are uttered against Communists and all those who take a different position. He talks about extremist manifestations, which puts him very much on his guard. And he does not want to participate in the collapse of our great state. But we do need a law on the economic independence of the republics. In moving over to economic independence and republican financial autonomy we are all in unequal positions. People in different places have received different amounts of spending on various items like education. that is how life has arisen. Those who are less favored will naturally begin to ask: Where is my share? The issue of the destiny of the USSR must now be looked at more keenly. That is what we should be considering. Danilyuk concludes by proposing that the laws on ownership and the economic independence of the republics be first adopted and that we than return to the wider issue of the destiny of the USSR.

1732 GMT

LD2411213189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1732 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev invites Deputy Toome from Estonia to take the floor.

Toome says that the issue under discussion ranges wider than the three Baltic republics—it concerns the destiny of each of the 15 republics under perestroyka, it concerns the further development of perestroyka. He speaks about the intensive preparation that has been taking place in Estonia for the changeover to the new economic system. We are accused of politicizing the issue of economic independence, Toome says, and continues: But we are not politicizing it—it is politicizing itself. We are constantly coming up against a blank wall of opposition from those who see themselves threatened. The question boils down to this: Are we going to have a new federation? Or are we going to preserve the virtually unlimited power of the center? He speaks about the large sums paid into the central budget by the Estonian economy. We are sometimes accused virtually of bringing the state to disintegration—but we seek the cohesion of the republics on the basis of the operation of a genuinely democratic and law-governed state, he says. Toome goes on to put forward counter-proposals to previously suggested amendments, article by article. Are we to develop the economy of the federation radically or not - that is the question, he asks in conclusion.

At 1744 GMT Gorbachev comments on the debate thus far: "Before giving the floor to Comrade Nazarbayev, I

think the beginning of the discussion requires that I say a few words. I don't think the beginning of the discussion promises that we shall reach the optimal solution which would be in the interests of the whole union and at the same time would give the possibility of prolonging that discussion and arriving at the adoption of a solution of what we began at the first session with the first reading. I think that the approaches of eyeball to eyeball and hammer and tongs is no style or method for the Supreme Soviet or in general for our public life and political process today.

"I would like us to hear each other. I mean everyone. Because both the last speech and the previous one were not the best standard, as it were. A note of ultimatum is creeping in. Well, that, you know, is unacceptable here. And there's no need to intimidate anyone here. But one thing I do think is that the Supreme Soviet must move along the path of principle; and the path of principle is that we are for the federation, but for a federation which is reformed and given full content as regards the sovereignty, rights, and duties, as regards economic independence and so on. And let us seek that.

"And I think that what we're discussing here today—the draft law for these republics—is an important step in that quest. Therefore I would not belittle the importance of what is taking place here, but it is necessary to seek, and harmonize interests here and not bring in those questions which should be examined on a different occasion when other documents are being adopted which, by the way, have already been discussed here and put forward for discussion. And so I request the comrades to respond to my appeal so that we can arrive at a law which will take account of the interests and, I would say, reflect the consensus of the Supreme Soviet and which will harmonize the interests on the whole of the republics and of the union and so on.

"When we speak of the union, it is the Union of Republics. It is not, as at were, some sort of monster or dinosaur. It's all of us. And so when the comrades attack the union, so to speak, they're actually stepping on their own throats. Let us pull together. We have unity in this. But let us seek and hear each other.

"The floor is given to Comrade Nazarbayev, Deputy Nazarbayev, and he'll be followed by Deputy Lesitskiy."

1747 GMT

LD2411215789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1747 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Nazerbayev from Kazakhstan takes the floor and says the federation is too valuable to throw away in one stroke. He says it is not too dificult to break something when compared with how hard it is to build something. He cites figures illustrating the importance of the federation of Kazakhstan. We have to work on the issue of economic ties between republics, he says. Perfecting the federation along democratic principles is the best way forward in the field of relations between the nationalities. In this respect we support the proposals of the Baltic republics; but we call upon them to take more precise steps toward strengthening the federation for the benefit of all republics.

At 1756 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Lisitskiy from the Ukraine to take the floor. Lisitskiy says that the issue of the monetary and credit system is one of the most important being considered. He recalls that according to the text books the USSR came into being as a voluntary union of the peoples. He says that the provisions of the monetary and credit system should be left in the form in which they were proposed by the deputies from the Baltic republics. Finally, he says he believes the draft should be adopted.

At 1804 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Kebich from Minsk to the floor. Kebich says that although the draft seems to concern just the three Baltic republics, it actually has a bearing upon all republics individually and on the union as a whole. He quotes the case of a refrigerator manufacturing association which includes both Belorussian and Lithuanian enterprises. Why should currency earned by the association just go to Lithuania? Those who drew up the draft should have shown greater regard for the feeling of other republics. He proposes an appropriate amendment to the proposed text of the bill. He says that the bill is far from being perfect and should be the subject of further work. The principles should be the same for all republics, though the details will of necessity vary from republic to republic as they are worked out.

At 1811 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Lauristin of Estonia to take the floor. Lauristin says that this is a very crucial part of the road covered by the Baltic peoples over the last couple of years. She is confident that all peoples of the union will now cover this road. We are deciding the issue not just of how we can get out of the economic crisis: We must also decide whether we have the ability and the will to achieve true self-determination, Lauristin says. It has been said that all must have equal starting positions: But that is an abstract concept. There are very substantial economic differences today between the different Soviet republics—that isn't to anyone's credit or discredit—it is simply a matter of history. She talks about yesterday's discussion of ecological problems—those were in fact examples of mismanagement from the center. What we are proposing is one possible model for the solution of these contradictions, she continues: we are prepared to carry the whole of the risk on our own shoulders. For others this is an experiment—for us it is our destiny. Lauristin insists that the law does not embody political points but economic ones.

At 1822 GMT Gorbachev announces a break. For 4 minutes video shows deputies milling around, conversations taking place on the rostrum.

At 1826 GMT Gorbachev asks deputies to retake their seats. He invites Deputy Orlov to take the floor. Orlov says that the draft bill under consideration is not just of economic significance today—it is also a political matter, since it is relevant to interethnic relations as well. He talks about the philosophy of the union republics toward these issues. There are two approaches: One—that all that is bad for the country is particularly bad for the Baltic republics. That's not new, he says, that was the approach of Kropotkin in his day. The second approach is that everything we are doing now is progress and everything that anyone else is doing—including the Central Committee—is bad, it is stagnation. Orlov says: I agree with Gorbachev—we have to seek compromises. Their draft bills stem from the two philosophical approaches. We are prisoners of our own decision that we took during the July session. We should not waste time going into details assessing the value of each republic's contribution. But I think that we could adopt the law in the form in which it now stands with amendments, or we could not adopt the law today but instead adopt a decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet should have adopted the law on ownership before this—but it was unable to do so for known reasons. But the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet did manage to do so. I do not think that that was fortuitous. Familarize yourselves with it and you'll see the answers to many questions that are exciting people now. Adopting this law, says Orlov, would effectively mean the end of federation—or the departure from the federation of individual republics.

At 1839 GMT Deputy Advadze of Tbilisi is invited by Gorbachev to take the floor. He thanks Gorbachev for his earlier comments. The issue is a major political issue, Advadze says, not only for the republics mentioned in the bill but for other republics, too. They are all waiting for the decision we are going to make. It is also part and parcel of perestroyka. What will it all lead to if we adopt it, Advadze asks. He suggests that the voting should be by name so that afterward it will be clear who carries the responsibility for the outcome. In conclusion, Advadze calls on the Supreme Soviet to adopt the draft that has been presented.

1845 GMT

LD2411235789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1845 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev invites Deputy Samarin from Orel Oblast to speak. Samarin regrets that today we cannot be discussing a law on the financial autonomy of Russia. Economic reform is impossible without changes of this kind. One should not keep asking how much the Baltic republics are going to get out of it. One agrees that they will be be supplied with raw materials—but they will pay for these with their own output. Samarin is in favor of the law being passed.

At 1849 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Yarovoy from Tallinn to speak. Yarovoy thinks of republican financial autonomy as a means of combatting the old ways of administering things by injunction. Yarovoy criticizes the methods used by Estonians in promoting their ideas. He criticizes deputies present who have not condemned those methods. Yarovoy says that in his view the bill cannot be passed in its present form. The basic laws on ownership and land must be adopted first.

At 1858 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Plotnieks of Riga to speak. Plotnieks comments on the importance of the equal measure—the equal measure of freedom to choose one's own destiny. We are moving along the road of renewing the federation, he says. Without renewal of the federation we will not get ourselves out of the pit of crisis. There must be several models of the union republic. Lenin said that the center should deal only with foreign affairs and defense. Stalin rejected the Leninist model of federation because it was unacceptable for him. There must be freedom of choice in equal measure for all—otherwise we will not move forward. One has to begin somewhere, he says. The people are waiting for movement forward to start. Plotnieks criticizes the amendments that have been proposed to Article 2. You cannot give someone something without taking something away from someone else, he points out. He goes on to speak about other specific provisions and the need for their retention. He proposes that deputies vote for the draft and that the last minute amendments be removed from the text of the bill.

At 1908 GMT Gorbachev invites Boris Yeltsin to take the floor. [Begin Yeltsin recording] Esteemed comrades! Today each of us USSR people's deputies sitting here or speaking is of course thinking both of our whole country and of the republic in which he lives. Perhaps we would all like Russia to be the first to have the status of economic autonomy. Especially perhaps those who live in Russia, perhaps the whole country. But unfortunately we have no such draft. Unfortunately Russia is not ready for it. Unfortunately, even the approaches on how to shape the law on economic autonomy for Russia are something we have no idea of today. And evidently we do need to amass experience with some smaller formations so that, even if the model is not quite perfect—perhaps it won't even be suitable—it may still do less damage than if the transition to economy autonomy were to occur first in the larger republics such as, say, the Russian Federation.

At the same time, however, the experiences of the three Baltic republics that have made the transition to economic autonomy will help the Russian Federation reduce the number of mistakes it makes when making the transition to economic autonomy.

I realize that certainly, from a purely legal, juridical, point of view, it would have been necessary first to pass a union law on ownership, on land, on enterprises, and then move on to the form of the transition to economic autonomy of the particular republics. But we're not managing to do it like that. We have knocked things down [provalili], so to speak, in that respect, at the first session of the Supremne Soviet when we passed 2 or 3 laws there out of 20. In this session, the second session of the Supreme Soviet, we'll probably pass 6 or 7 laws out of the almost 30 that we planned to pass on the first day when we were discussing the agenda for this second USSR Supreme Soviet session. That process is going on very painfully and with great difficulty. Indeed, generally, we are probably by no means all professionally prepared for this issue. I think the fact that the deputies—and on the whole the three Baltic republics—have proposed their own version of the transition to economic autonomy should be fully supported. It should be supported if only because we have already satisfied ourselves that in any case we have to move toward the decentralization of the country: Decentralization of the economy, decentralization of social issues, and so on and so on.

If we don't accept this issue [prinyat vopros] today, we'll again say that everything will be decided by the center: All issues, great or small, will be decided by the center. Where all that has gotten us, we already know perfectly well, both from ethnic relations and from the standard of living of our people in the country and by the state of the economy and from the state of our finances and so on. I think that of course the committees and commissions that worked on the draft which passed the [corrects himself] was approved in the first reading on 27 July did a thorough job. But nevertheless they did not cover all the points. I think that all the same on the issue of the second, second, second point—that is of the first article concerning ownership—I am more in agreement with the proposal of, I think it was Deputy Orlov, who said that it will not do to just leave it empty in this way.

We must in some way—either from the point of view of the draft that has already passed two readings and which has been published as a draft, or in some other form—let the lawyers give this some thought, but we must certainly include here the issue of ownership, or at least of possession—not ownership, but possession—of land, minerals, and so on.

And the question regarding Article 2, it's the second paragraph, I am of course in favor of the version that was approved in the first reading and not in favor of that which has been proposed today by the committees and commissions. Respectfully, I think the deputies will respond in some way to the initiative of the Baltic republics and will not reproach them because they see here very, very much some double, triple, or some other meaning: After all what they see is that they somehow have got to put in order their own work and economy in their own republics and thereby have their effect in improving the economic condition of the whole country. And the fact that today decisions are coming from the center which are altogether lacking in common sense and contradict that which the people want can be seen from the last document.

In this connection I want to read out and pose as a question to USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Comrade Gorbachev the following: As has become known, the USSR Government has drawn up and adopted a special decision providing for a considerable increase in the wages of officials of the central administrative bodies, ministries, soviet executive committees, party, trade-union and Komsomol committees and other staff of the administrative apparatus. [sounds of agitation in hall] Very well, I ask here—I won't read it out, I ask that the USSR Government should decipher for us fully what amounts are going from what items for this purpose, insofar as this has bypassed the USSR Supreme Soviet. I call on you once again to support the proposal to transfer the Baltic republics to economic autonomy. Thank you. [applause] [end recording]

At 1915 GMT Gorbachev calls Deputy Yusupov to the floor. Yusupov is from Dagestan. He says that the Baltic republics' initiative is indeed of widespread interest. He believes it is difficult to discuss financial autonomy for individual republics separately from the economic situation in the country as a whole. What we need is not a template, but general principles, he says. He makes a number of observations.

At 1923 GMT Gorbachev invites Deputy Sukhov of the Ukraine to the floor. Sukhov expresses concern over the way the Supreme Soviet session is failing to move forward and produce results. He asks what is meant by the words law-governed state and gives his own answer. He calls upon deputies to defer matters until later. At 1927 GMT Gorbachev calls upon Deputy Ubaydullayeva from Tashkent. She says that the need for economic independence of the republics stems from perestroyka. She believes the wish of each republic to build economic relations on the basis of horizontal ties and mutual interest is quite legitimate. She compares economic indicators from her own Uzbekistan with those of the Baltic republics. The gap between them, she says, is getting greater. The state must ensure that the people in poor republics do not suffer in terms of social and welfare spending by comparison with those in prosperous ones. Ubaydullayeva concludes, suggesting Estonia might solve its labor shortage in conjunction with Uzbekistan where the concern is to find jobs for people.

At 1936 GMT Gorbachev calls upon Deputy Engver from Udmurt ASSR to speak. Engver says that his parents were Latvians but he has always lived in Russia and spoken Russian. His main question is whether adopting this law will further perestroyka or will it not? He believes it will further it. He appeals to all his Latvian brothers and brothers from the Baltic to solve all their problems in a brotherly way. We want to move perestroyka forward so we must adopt the law—but we must

help those who have been held back by what happened during the years of stagnation. Let us reach a consensus, he suggests.

At 1945 GMT Gorbachev asks Deputy Matyukhin of Gorkiy to speak, but to limit himself to 3 minutes. Matyukhin talks of the interests of all-union enterprises based in the Baltic republics. He notes the problems of the Baltic republics' railway system. Conditions for the Baltic republics going onto financial autonomy are present and should be utilized.

1949 GMT

LD2511000989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1949 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Gorbachev takes the floor:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Comrades, let us consult about how we are going to proceed from here. First: I think that the situation is, generally speaking, clear from the point of view of the positions. Subsequent discussion shows that the various speeches actually revolve around the positions taken here. Therefore, the positions have been crystallized and the only thing is whether more people or fewer people support this; and that is another question. If one is to summarize the results briefly in this way, then first of all the question that is under discussion is, indeed, an important and major one. It is a very important one, affecting all of us. In this case, I have in mind the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, all the peoples; the whole of our union.

I think we have an interest in everyone getting interested in the best possible law being adopted on this question—the optimum document. The draft that emerged as a result of the work of the consultative commission has been put in doubt. On the one hand, it has been raised in such a way that it needs to be examined and adopted. At any rate, it can be discussed; but as for adopting it, this can be done after the laws pertaining to ownership, federation, and so forth have been adopted,—the law on the enterprise, on land. I am not going to list them all, it is clear what I am talking about. Others—including above all the representatives of the republics that asked the Supreme Soviet to give them the right to carry out this experiment and adopt the law on economic independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—they also see in the draft that has been presented a document that fails to satisfy them.

I think all the difficulties that manifested themselves in the discussion, these difficulties are understandable, hence the contradictoriness of the positions; but the contradictions are real.

We are taking a very important step with regard to perestroyka and along this important direction. It is a step toward giving a real and new content to our federation. It will proceed along the path of expanding rights as far as the sovereignty of the republics is concerned, their political and state rights as state formations. It will touch upon the economic rights and the economic independence of the republics. It will touch upon what pertains to the cultural and linguistic sphere and so on. It is a process which we have programmed by our decisions, both what was reflected in the political platform of the CPSU on this question, what was said at the Congress of People's Deputies, and what is being said here all the time—what is present here in the Supreme Soviet, both at the first session and at the second session.

How are we to get out of this situation so as to remove the concerns? Concerns, I have to say, the nature of which we have to understand and find a document and reach a solution of a kind that will remove these concerns. I think that it is necessary to single out and enshrine in the law only that which is genuinely essential for the implementation of economic independence and not to overburden this law with issues which go beyond the confines of this subject-matter. I think that it is precisely this overburdening, the presence of these elements—moreover the comrades from the three republics also sent us a second version recently, in addition to the document that had earlier been adopted in the first reading. And it seemed to me that the deputies who took the floor mainly criticized precisely this variant because it was at their disposal, while the version which was amplified by the consultative commission—as I consider it, the first one to have been discussed—not everyone was even able properly to study this amplified version. So I think that more work has to be done to achieve something that would satisfy all those comrades who have voiced concerns of one kind or another. First, relationships between the union budget and the republican budget have already been resolved within the framework of the confirmation of the plan for 1990.

[Indistinct comment from floor. Gorbachev responds "What?" Further indistinct remark from floor.]

Yes, and they have been resolved at the same time for these republics and they provide them with an opportunity to realize, so to speak, the principles of regional financial autonomy—to operate. This is very important. Second, this law, which has been proposed by the consultative commission, this version contains something which makes it possible to include other instruments, too, so to speak and to expand possibilities for intensifying the economic independence of the republics.

Combining both of these, in my view, provides everything needed to begin this experiment and move along this road. If one were to overburden this topic with associated issues, especially those that have been given over to discussion, including discussion by the whole people, or which are being put forward for that purpose, then we would be encountering and creating obstacles of a kind that generally speaking we will never sort out here.

So, what is the conclusion? Is there a way out on the basis of the discussion that has taken place? I think that there is. In connection with this, I think that we—the Supreme Soviet—could, on the basis of what has taken place here during our morning sitting, we could instruct the government, together with the committees that were dealing with this issue, to take into acount all the concerns voiced here and to submit to the Supreme Soviet by Monday a slimmed-down and agreed-upon version so as to get things moving forward, comrades, moving forward.

We all have an interest in the process of searching for solutions to questions within the framework of perestroyka, including in this area, where it is a question of the activity of the federation. We have an interest in our achieving certain optimum solutions. But the comrades were right in putting the question here that all of this must strengthen the federation, bring it to a new quality, to new relationships.

I believe that if we do not move we will not do anything. And in this sense I would issue the following instruction, if you comrades are in agreement with this. How do you feel, Comrades? [Voices from floor say "yes"] Let all those who have been doing the work continue to do the same work and let all of you think about what has taken place here. But I would merely ask that the document—if we want to raise it on Monday—that the deputies should have the possibility of receiving it on Sunday at the very latest, during the day. Observation: so that all deputies of the Supreme Soviet might be able to review it, both the members of the Supreme Soviet and the people's deputies who are taking part in this session. Then it will be possible to continue the discussion and finally reach a conclusion.

I only call upon you once again, comrades, to seek and to find optimum solutions. We have to move forward. I think that if we do not move, we will not solve a single problem. We have reached the most difficult stage. No matter what, the reform question is going to be difficult. There are some difficult subjects and problems as well. There too, we are going to have to seek out and act. Land—we have seen; lease-contracting—the same. And so on. It is difficult everywhere. But we have to find a consensus, we have to go step by step in every area, we have to advance the transformation and perestroyka, comrades.

Can we put that instruction of the Supreme Soviet to the vote? That it instruct the government and the appropriate committees which have taken part and which have delivered reports here to conduct, to continue work on the basis of the discussion that has taken place within the framework of the Supreme Soviet and to present to deputies on Sunday a version upon which further work has been done so that it can be put forward for discussion on Monday?

[Unidentified deputy] There is a proposal that the working out of the new agreed concept or version of this document be entrusted either to the consultative commission which worked on it earlier or to the main committee which works on economic reform and thus involving the USSR Government and representatives of the three republics. [Gorbachev] Well of course, comrades—those who took part. That is what I had in mind. It should not be cut down. On the contrary, those who have already been involved, who have some kind of mutual understanding, it will be easier for them, so to speak, to continue this work. But on the basis of the first version which we all approved on first reading, and on the basis of what was discussed today. Is that so, comrades? [voices say "yes".]

Those in favor of adopting this instruction please vote. You can vote. Who is in favor? Against? How many abstentions? The issue is decided. [video shows voting results: 351 for, 20 against, and 22 abstentions] [end recording]

Gorbachev says that work will now finish but there will be an announcement.

An unidentified deputy asks deputies interested in joining the deputies club to stay in the hall afterwards for 15 minutes. At 2002 GMT there is a 15-minute break in the televised recording.

At 2017 GMT the relay resumes with Lukyanov in the chair and the registration of deputies: 387 are present. At 2018 GMT Lukyanov reopens the session and says: "As you know, comrade deputies, in accordance with the instructions of the Supreme Soviet, the Committee and Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order and the Committee on Glasnost, human rights, and appeals of Citizens have prepared a draft law on the press and other mass media. The materials on this issue have been distributed to you three times. You have probably seen the printed version on which the committees asked each deputy to comment. Then there's the version supplemented and corrected by the committees, and another amplified version.

"Let me say straight away that today we shall be discussing a complex issue of the greatest importance, in which we all have an interest. And we'll be giving it a first reading, so of course the discussion will be above all about the concept of the law and the main innovations that are being introduced into the legislative regulation of the mass news media. Before giving the floor to the rapporteurs, I want to tell you that we have received several telegrams from the creative unions, mainly, saying: We request postponement of examination by the Supreme Soviet of the draft law on the press and other mass media. We consider it desirable that it should be examined after preliminary discussion in the creative unions and other public organizations. People's Deputies Vasnetsov, chairman of the board of the USSR Artists' Union; Ugarov, president of the Academy of the Arts. There are several such telegrams. I think we have no reason to postpone the discussion, especially as the discussion will be taking place in the first reading.

"The second matter is this: I want to tell you at once that before we began the discussion, in the course of the last 4 days, a register was being kept of the speakers. And just what I've received, in the order in which the comrades made their applications, I have here 39 names. I therefore ask both our esteemed rapporteurs and those who'll be speaking to be economical of time. Let us try to hear everyone. The question is of the utmost importance, connected with pluralism of opinions, and here we need patience, as always.

"So, for a report on behalf of the committees, the floor is given to Comrade Shakhnazarov, member of the Committee on Legality [corrects himself], Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, the deputy chairman of that committee, who headed that group."

2021 GMT

LD2511003789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2021 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Shaknazarov speaks on the draft law. He criticizes censorship and notes that many talented writers in the past have had to publish their work underground and that the Soviet people were denied access to many great works, including much of Bulgakov's work. He quotes absurd examples of censorship in the past. Glasnost has put an end to this order of things. This draft law is exceptional as it concerns constitutional matters, he says. It is of equal importance with the law on property. The most difficult matter in the drawing up of the draft law, he says, was in giving maximum freedom of print while safeguarding the public's interest in matters which should not be public knowledge. The main features of the law are: general principles of freedom of the press and the removal of censorship, citizens are free to spread their opinions in the mass media, as are public bodies, religious bodies etc. There is to be pluralism of opinion. The law is in accordance with international human rights declarations. Abuses of the legislation will not be permitted. There is to be no interference in editorial independence. Libel is not to be permitted and the law forbids the press to print libel under the threat of severe sanctions. Journalists have the right to receive information from state bodies, only state secrets cannot be revealed to them. Clause 35 has a list of the rights of journalists. Journalists have duties as well, Shaknazarov says: To be honest, objective and correct. Sensationalist journalism should not be allowed. Should private individuals be allowed to own parts of the press? This is covered by Clause 6, around which there have been many stormy discussions.

At 2042 GMT Lukyanov says that if there are any questions they should be in written form. One deputy complains and Lukyanov says that he should speak with Shaknazarov personally.

At 2043 GMT Deputy Nikolskiy, deputy chairman of the committee on glasnost, agrees that this draft law is very important as glasnost is not as yet enshrined in law. The right of every citizen to information is necessary, he says. Freedom of the press will prevent a return to the past, to Stalinism, as such phenomena are possible only by suppressing the press. He asks whether such a law necessary—the United States for example only has a small clause in its Constitution providing for freedom of the press. However, he says, the USSR exists in different conditions and a law is necessary to break the traditions of the past where the party has had a monopoly over the press. He complains that certain additions have been made to the draft law without the knowledge and discussion of the relevant committees. Nikolskiy says that the legislation should be in accordance with the Vienna agreement on human rights. State secrets should be protected. The draft law has attracted much attention and should be adopted in its first reading.

At 2057 GMT Lukyanov suggests that Deputy Federov should be allowed to reply to criticism.

Federov says that discussions on the draft law are very complicated, and that a working group introduced amendments to the law. The amendments were worked out over a long period. People will not be able to own newspapers but will be able to establish them. He proposes a new clause instead of the first clause to renew the Leninist conception of socialism.

At 2105 GMT Deputy Rakhmanova is called upon but does not appear. An unidentified deputy starts to speak. He thinks that this draft law is an ideological law. Everyone refers to the Vienna document when talking of the fact that citizens have the right to establish newspapers, but he thinks that citizens should be able to produce newspapers. A mechanism for demonopolization is necessary.

At 2114 GMT Deputy Yezhelev, IZVESTIYA correspondent in Leningrad, touches on three specific issues concerning the draft law. He says that for many years people have not been free to print what they like which is against international practice. Now a new level of understanding has been reached where people's rights are being respected, the draft law on the press and property show this. Some people are against citizens having the right to establish newspapers as this may be misused by some people. These arguments carry no water however. The present monopoly of the press has also been misused, and there will always be those ready to abuse freedoms. No interference is to be allowed in the running of the press and mass media.

At 2122 GMT Deputy Pokhitaylo speaks. He says that there are doubts on the right of citizens to establish newspapers. The question of editorial statutes being drawn up is incomplete. Who in a newspaper makes up the collective to decide upon such statutes? The question of giving out information from public and state bodies is

also under doubt, as such bodies have their own constitutions which they have to follow. There are many other shortcomings which Pokhitaylo will submit in writing. Much further work is needed on the draft law.

At 2127 GMT Deputy Batynskaya from Krasnoyarsk says that the latest variant of the draft law completely changes the nature of the draft law on the press. The law holds editors and journalists responsible if they publish state secrets—this is enforcing on them ideological, preliminary censorship, she says. Such secrets will only make their way into the public domain if a state body reveals them, so responsibility lies with them. There should be no censorship at all. In Britain there has been no censorship since the 17th Century, she alleges. Party committees often let it be known what can and cannot be printed—this must be stopped. Clause 43 allows for the return of censorship and the deputy protests against the additions made to it. The press is striving to remain under the control of their establishers—the party, trade unions etc. Profits from the press should be put at the disposal of the editorial board. She says the journal CHELOVEK I ZAKON has a profit of 50 million rubles a year and yet receives none of this money. This draft law is the test point for Soviet democratic society, she concludes.

2135 GMT

LD2511005789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2135 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet 24 November session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Lukyanov reads out a note concerning the statutes of the session and then hands the floor over to Deputy Kuptsov of Volodga Oblast.

At 2136 GMT Kuptsov says the majority of workers give particular attention to this draft law. The law will make clear the relations between party organizations and the mass media. The draft law takes into account many people's opinions, but further work is necessary. There is no mention in the law of the people and socialism. Kuptsov thinks this should be included in the draft law, as it is society's goal. The mass media should be a social institution working for the goals of perestroyka. The right of individual citizens to found newspapers etc. causes concern as it may be abused. The draft law should be published and approved, Kuptsov concludes.

At 2141 GMT Deputy Yemelyanov from Mari ASSR speaks on the independence of the mass media, the lack of which has been a cause of crisis for decades. We need to react to the opinions of the electorate. He talks of the case of the editor of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY who was sacked for mistakes. However, everyone makes mistakes and such interference should no longer be tolerated. The party should influence by example, not by interfering and putting pressure on the press. A defense mechanism needs to be worked out and implemented.

At 2147 GMT Deputy Rachmanova speaks and apologizes for not being present earlier when called. The law will not work in real life unless certain conditions are introduced, she says. Local programs are important on television and radio and should be encouraged. However, there is still too much central television even though there are many talented collectives in the provinces.

At 2153 GMT Deputy Shamba from Abkhaziya wishes to cooperate on working out the draft law. The process of perestroyka in the press is complex. Shamba says the press is the child of democracy; the press is responsible before the public and vice versa. The public must supply the press with information, and the press must treat this information objectively. The press should not be free to disregard the needs and wants of society, but should serve them. He thinks the draft law should say that the press is part of socialist society. It helps society to hold constructive dialogue and gives the right of receiving an answer. Shamba has remarks on many of the clauses which he will give to the relevant commission.

At 2201 GMT Deputy Potapov, member of the committee on glasnost, does not wish to repeat what other speakers have said. The draft law is a defense of democracy and glasnost. We should create the conditions for allowing every citizen to have access to the mass media and information. Editors should listen to the opinions of their founders.

At 2209 GMT Deputy Volkov from Sverdlovsk speaks and says that this draft law is without precedent. He says that we should be careful not to fall into traps and that the draft law must be made to work. The draft law provides for prosecution of those who spread racial and other extreme views, yet no cases of such articles being printed has ever come to court, although the courts can deal with such cases already. The draft law will remove obstacles to democracy.

At 2215 GMT Lukyanov says that it is already 1800 (local time) and asks whether the session is to continue. One deputy says that only those who will not repeat what has already been said should be allowed to speak. Lukyanov proposes a break of 10 minutes and then prolonging the session to 1900.

At 2218 GMT the recording continues with Lukyanov proposing several speakers for the next part of the session.

At 2220 GMT Deputy Kharchenko of Kalinin speaks and wonders whether the draft law on press might allow groups battling for power to misuse the new freedoms. We are all against the dictatorship of the producer over the consumer, and yet the draft law will allow this. The rejection of censorship is corrected, yet who will be responsible for the moral content of the mass media? Who will control quality? There is no mention of responsibility, especially responsibility for the accuracy of information printed or broadcast. The law says that information must be checked, but before or after being

made public? The party press should be guided not only by the law but also by their founding party organs.

At 2228 GMT Deputy Yevtushenko speaks and says that it is paradoxical that a draft law which rejects censorship is itself subject to preliminary censorship as it is much discussed behind closed doors. The draft law in its first variant is a great step forward, but the second variant is a dangerous step backward. He proposes that the first variant be voted on to some applause. There is some confusion in the wording of the draft law, which should be clarified.

At 2236 GMT Deputy Kulakova from Ulyanovsk speaks and says that more than 300 telegrams have been received demanding that newspapers should be published and delivered on time. The postal service is not sufficiently refunded for the cost of delivering newspapers and journals to subscribers—this should be changed, and tariffs worked out at local levels. Delays in deliveries in periodicals and newspapers are announced and compensation paid out in Finland—similar measures should be in force in the Soviet Union. The government should study this question. Publishers should be more responsible for schedules and introduce measures to show more discipline in this matter. She asks the publishers to consider her proposals.

2244 GMT

LD2511010689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2244 GMT on 24 November continues its recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 24 November at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Vadim Medvedev takes the floor:

[Begin Medvedev recording] Esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet, people's deputies! I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on the discussion of the law on the press and other mass news media and express my opinion of this law. I think the adoption of a press law does indeed represent an exceedingly important milestone and action in our common movement toward a state based on the rule of law and a civilian society. I think this law must on the one hand reflect the profound changes that have been happening—have happened and are happening—in the ideological and informational sphere, while on the other hand, must also give a new impetus to that process and determine, as one says, its state and legal framework. I think each of us, reflecting back on the years that have passed, can say with every justification that in those years deep changes of enormous importance for our country have taken place in the sphere of information. In general we are now beginning to get used to this, but these changes really are remarkable. They have actually placed us in new conditions of life and work and created a new sociopolitical climate in our country. Our newspapers and magazines, television, and cinema represent a very broad palette of opinions and positions, judgements, views, and appraisals. Never before have the mass media commanded so much attention or played such a considerable role in the life of our society.

There have also been radical changes in the system of management of this sphere. In effect, the previous system of management of the mass news media, based on total control and direct administrative regulation, has been dismantled. In effect, the system of prior control of published materials known as censorship has lost its former functions. All restrictions on press subscriptions have been entirely abolished. Though this decision, actually made last year, was a political decision and has been maintained with great difficulty with regard to paper and printing capacities, and in other respects, I don't think we will ever permit a return to the previous system of restricting subscriptions.

All of these are positive changes, the real result of perestroyka and an important factor in its development. I think that we all understand the enormous role that is played by the mass information media in taking the processes of perestroyka deeper, in all our spheres, not only ideological spheres but in economic and political spheres too. At the same time there are problems and contradictions here too. As in other aspects of renewal here, too, the well-known gap forming between the dismantling of the old and the birth of the new is making itself felt. The former methods of regulating the information sphere have fallen away, but new methods characteristic of the law-governed state are still lacking or are still adhering to old norms and traditions that are coming to the end of their days. Under these conditions some people, on the basis of their impression that everything is collapsing, have an intensified desire to pull in the reins, as they say, to take a firmer hold of old methods and ways of managing the press, to continue to issue commands and decrees and run things by injunction. This is not in the spirit of the times. We do not adhere to such methods; we are conducting a campaign against them and we are overcoming them step by step.

Others suffer the symptoms of a kind of decompression sickness or intoxicationn with the freedom of the press. In places the freedom from constraint develops into undue liberties and other extremes, too. They manifest themselves in group passions and in attempts to impose one point of view and to substitute one half-truth with another half-truth and to use glasnost to satisfy personal ambitions, including those that are antisocialist in character. The so-called informal, nonregistered publications, that is to say ones that are outside the law, have come into being like mushrooms after rain. Throughout the country there are many hundreds of these, and particularly in some republics where order has not been established in this sense, nor, indeed, can it be established without a law on the press. We must not agree to this or permit this if we really do want to live in a law-governed state.

The adoption of the law on the press in my view therefore represents an acute and vital requirement, and

we have done and we continue to do everything to ensure that this law on the press is passed and implemented. Of course, I think that everyone understands that one cannot regard a law on the press in absolute terms. Also of importance here are legal standards and stable democratic traditions. A great deal depends upon the civic stance of the journalist, the editor, the publisher, the founder and other individuals participating in this matter. [voices from floor]

[Lukyanov] Just a moment, comrades. The time allotted has not yet run out. [rumbles of discontent in the hall]

[Medvedev] Nevertheless the law is the main factor—I have 3 more minutes, I can speak—the main factor regulating relations in the information sphere. Does the draft law that has been presented correspond to those goals? I think that generally it evidently is possible to respond in the affirmative to this question. The envisioned changes indeed bear a fundamental character. This has been mentioned here. However, adoption of the draft law or even its publication in the press is such a responsible business that it is clearly necessary to analyze it again and again, first and foremost from the angle of just how fully the interests of all sides participating in the information process are reflected. I really have had occasion—the comrades mentioned this—to participate in the work on the law and in the discussion of it, and in consultations at various stages. These problems also were discussed at the ideological commission of the party's Central Committee.

What is the most characteristic thing that caught the eye? It is the sharp differentiation of opinions, depending on what side and what party in the information process is represented by a participant in the discussion. If the latter were workers in the mass information media, they mostly cared for the rights of the journalistic workshop, claiming at times the role of the fourth estate in society and the ultimate truth. Of course, we relate to journalists with immense respect and with support. We attempt to guard them and to protect their interests. At the same time the sphere of their activity should not be beyond the sphere of criticism and beyond the sphere of discussion. This is an entirely natural process. If they were founders or representatives of state, public and other organizations, then here aspirations were expressed mostly for preservation of the levers of influence over and of monitoring the mass information media. Publishers place economic interests to the fore, and so on.

Only one voice, the main voice, that of citizens and of organizations as objects of journalists' attention, news and criticism, perhaps was not heard in the preliminary discussions. I think that this had an effect to some extent on the content of the law. I agree here with a number of remarks and proposals from the comrades about the necessity of improving a number of articles in this law. I think that popular discussion will enable us to hear also the voice of the one who is the main figure—that is the people themselves, the reader, he for whom the press is published, for whom the mass information media exist and who should be the supreme judge in this matter, too.

I have considered the draft, taking into account the proposed amendments. I consider the amendment to clause 6 to be lawful, and I think that Comrade Kravchenko put forward an intelligent proposal to reflect also the formula of the Vienna document, and in this way conclude references to it, but at the same time to refrain from a broad interpretation of the right to establish mass media. I consider that it is necessary to amend clause 43 as well, to amend not only its basic text, but also to amend the amendment that was introduced because it really may create the impression of interference in the ordinary activity of the mass media and some preliminary censoring of materials. There is a question, but I have used up my time.

[Lukyanov] Thank you. No, Vadim Andreyevich, I think that it is possible to simply answer the author. Let's finish.

[Medvedev] I can answer, can I answer?

[Lukyanov] Please do.

[Medvedev] [reading question] Can you clarify your announcement that as long as you are at the helm Solzhenitsyn will not be published in the USSR?

I have never made such an announcement. I expressed my personal opinion, which I still hold now, which I still hold now, that Solzhenitsyn's social and political views contradict the basic, world outlook or potential of our society, since they are aimed against the socialist foundations of our system. I have never made any such announcement with regard to any publication while I have stood at the helm.

[Lukyanov] Vadim Andreyevich, is there anything else?

[Medvedev] A question on STROITELNAYA GAZETA, but I think that it is separate, it does not concern everybody. Thank you. [end recording]

At 2255 GMT Lukyanov asks if the proceedings should end and calls for a vote on this. Voices are heard from the hall and then Lukyanov gives three minutes to Mukhtarov to speak. Deputy Mukhtarov says that we have been living under conditions of a monopoly of the mass media.

At 2258 GMT Lukyanov asks Mukhtarov to give his suggestions to the relevant commission. Mukhtarov then proposes the discussion continue on Monday as this draft law is very important. Lukyanov asks all deputies who have not been able to speak to give their proposals to the commission. He notes that amendments have been proposed to 26 of the law's clauses.

A vote is taken on whether to halt proceedings. An electronic screen shows 290 for, 18 against, with 3 abstaining. However there is no quorum of 362 deputies so the vote will have to take place on Monday. The

deputies reregister to check their numbers—but there are still not enough to make up the quorum.

On Monday the adoption of the draft law will be voted on. The commission will examine the draft law over the weekend.

At 2303 GMT an unidentified deputy asks which draft law is to be approved as he has two versions before him. Lukyanov says that only one text should be presented Another unidentified deputy asks that the committee on international affairs be allowed to participate in the further development of this law. Lukyanov agrees. A draft law on land has been printed. Lukyanov asks that the deputies take a copy on leaving the hall so they can study it and approve it in its first reading on Monday.

At 2306 GMT Deputy Makhanov goes to speak but is interrupted by unidentified deputy who complains that some deputies are being favored in being chosen to speak. Deputy Yaroshenko asks for a procedural point to be cleared up concerning the work of the committees and commissions. Deputy Makhanov says that various committees and commissions are to meet over the weekend. He gives details of times and places.

At 2312 GMT Lukyanov notes that only 2 days remain to work and asks that those two days be used to the maximum. He closes the session which will reopen on Monday 27 November at 1000 Moscow time, 0700 GMT.

Gorbachev Chairs Baltic Autonomy Debate 24 Nov

LD2411120289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 24 November, in its "Soyuz" program, carries a Gennadiy Kolenov report from the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is chairing this session, put forward for discussion a draft law, recalling that it had been approved by the Supreme Soviet in its first reading, on the economic independence of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics."

Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform, told how the draft had been prepared and proposed its adoption. Kalmykov of the Committee for Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, and Vilkas of the Commission for the Social and Economic Development of the Union Republics, supported the draft.

"Deputy Valov, representing the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, noted the contradictory nature of some points of the draft and said that this draft law violates the equality of all union republics. The floor was then given to Deputy Prunskene, who said that this draft law had a difficult passage and that she was worried about the inequality between the center and the republics regarding material and technical supplies and other questions. She felt that the draft law had cut back the rights of the republics with regard, in particular, to the question of ownership.

"Deputy Sharin in his speech said that this draft law was premature and that you cannot build a house starting from the roof. During the discussion, he was supported by Deputy Danilyuk who said that a law on property in the USSR and on the economic autonomy of all republics must be adopted first.

"During this acute discussion, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had this to say: One must not go at it hammer and tongs. I would like us to listen to each other. We are in favor of a strong and developing federation and we must together seek the optimal path of common interests. Then the discussion continued.

"At the moment a deputy representing the Baltic republics is at the rostrum. Then there will be a short interval and afterward the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work."

Further on Autonomy Debate

LD2411161789 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament concentrated today on the problem of what the federation of Soviet Republics would be like in the future. The Supreme Soviet discussed a bill to grant economic independence to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia approved in the first reading by the summer session.

From the very outset the discussion had a pronounced political tinge. The view was expressed that the bill, tabled by the Baltic republics, aimed to achieve their secession from the union. Deputy Nikolay Danilyuk, from the Soviet Far East, vigorously opposed the bill, saying that he did not wish to "contribute to the union's disintegration".

This view was countered by Estonian Prime Minister Indrek Toome. In his opinion, the bill was not designed to counterpose the interests of different union republics, but was the first step towards a new Soviet federation. He made several peremptory statements.

Passions flew so high that President Gorbachev, who presided over the morning meeting, had to remind the deputies that ultimatums never produced good results. Gorbachev stressed that the main purpose of the reform was clear—to give the Soviet federation new content, including in the economic sphere.

After that the debate became more constructive. Many deputies noted that questions of interaction among Soviet republics were not sufficiently reflected in the bill and the rights of the union were not made clear.

The view was also expressed that the bill could not be approved before the adoption of other fundamental economic legislations. Vladimir Valov of Russia and several other deputies claimed that the granting of exceptional economic rights to the three republics would increase the economic disbalance and interfere with the formation of a single national market.

Advocating their bill, Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian deputies stressed they were offering only one possible model of republican economic independence and that they were ready to assume complete responsibility for its success or failure. Several representatives of other regions of the country agreed with this.

Moscow's Boris Yeltsin said that the experience of the Baltic republics would help other republics avoid possible mistakes.

The Baltic deputies insisted that their republics be given exceptional property rights to land and natural resources, the right to regulate the monetary and credit system independently. They believe that without this their economic independence would not make sense.

They disagreed with the proposal of many deputies to lay down in the future law that natural resources are the commonly-owned property of the peoples of the corresponding republics and of the union as a whole.

Taking into account that all these problems affect the interests of the country, President Gorbachev moved to give further thought to the document and submit it for discussion again on Monday, November 27. The session agreed to this.

At the beginning of the week the Soviet parliament prolonged its session which was to end today, for several more days to have time to discuss several bills.

Supreme Soviet Session Resumes 27 Nov

LD2711072589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet have just gathered for a joint sitting of the chambers. They will be examining draft laws on the economic independence of the Baltic republics and on the press, and will discuss the matter of urgent measures for improving the country's environmental health and other draft laws.

Morning Session Summarized

LD2711130289 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Soviet parliament returned at today's morning session to the discussion of several bills debated last week and relegated for further elaboration to parliamentary committees and commissions.

The Supreme Soviet approved in its first reading the basic provisions of the bill on the press and other mass media that was discussed on November 24 and decided to publish it for nation-wide discussion.

The document, elaborated by the parliamentary committees on legislation and glasnost, guarantees freedom of the press and safeguards the rights of journalists. Work on proposed amendments and alternatives will be continued.

The deputies also passed a decision on urgent measures to promote the country's ecological health, also discussed last week. This document reflects the Soviet public's growing concern about the extremely serious ecological situation in many areas of the USSR.

The document states, among other things, that beginning in 1990 all economic programmes and projects will be financed only after a corresponding ecological expertise. It is also planned to carry out an analysis of earlier adopted programmes for agriculture's chemicalisation, the development of nuclear energetics and the chemical industry.

The decision calls on corresponding departments to draw up additional measures to ensure fuller safety of nuclear reactors in the USSR, to consider the question of stopping nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk testing ground in Kazakhstan and to look into the aftereffects of nuclear tests on the northern testing ground (Novaya Qemlya) and the adjoining territories. The government has been asked to submit a long-term state environment protection programme to parliament's spring session.

At its morning meeting the Supreme Soviet also approved bills on the status and procedure of recalling people's deputies of the USSR. These documents will be submitted for approval to the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which will open in Moscow on December 12.

Soviet parliamentary will continue its work in the afternoon.

Press Bill Considered

LD2711113289 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament again met today for a joint sitting of the two houses, presided over by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Last week the parliament was to adjourn for the weekend on Friday [24 November] but extended its session for several days to discuss a number of important bills.

At today's sitting the deputies continued the discussion of the press bill. They had begun to discuss it on Friday.

The deputies are to finalize the consideration of a package of bills establishing a procedure for the work of top state power bodies and the rights of deputies.

The parliament is also expected to pass a resolution on urgent measures to improve the ecological situation in the country. It was discussed last week.

The deputies will also continue the consideration of the bill on the economic independence of the Soviet Baltic republics.

Baltic Autonomy Law Adopted

LD2711150689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1440 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Nov (TASS)—A TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

The Soviet parliament today adopted a law on the economic independence of the three Baltic union republics—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. It secures their right to conduct their economies independently and provides for their equal participation in union activity. At the same time it is stressed that the provisions of the law function in relation to republics which are in the USSR's federal system.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Article on Socialism Published

PM2711101389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Nov 89 First Edition pp 1-3

[Article by M. Gorbachev: "The Socialist Idea and Revolutionary Perestroyka"]

[Text]

I. Where Are We Going? The Meaning and Mission of Perestroyka

Perestroyka has already almost reached the 5-year mark in its history. The process of revolutionary transformation in society initiated by the decisions of April 1985 is under way, acquiring a new and more extensive scale and new depth. As perestroyka has started to come into ever closer contact with the "bedrock" of our economic and social activity, we have started viewing many things in a different light.

We have gradually approached a fuller and more rounded realization of what we have built, what we are restructuring, and what sort of new society we are moving toward, and, consequently, we are getting quite a clear understanding of the meaning of what we are doing. Whereas initially we believed that it was mainly just a question of rectifying certain deformations in the social organism and improving the largely settled system that had emerged in preceding decades, we are now talking about the need to radically rebuild our entire social edifice—from the economic foundations to the superstructure. And we are not just talking about it, but actually taking practical steps to reform ownership relations, the economic mechanism, and the political system, and to change the spiritual and moral climate in society.

But, having embarked on the path of these revolutionary transformations, we are obliged to correlate them with the future and think about the fundamental theoretical basis for all our work. Without such strategic approaches and without constantly keeping an eye on fundamental issues it is impossible to make progress.

The party's theoretical work since April 1985 has been a stage in our understanding of ourselves and our movement toward an appropriate understanding of the immediate and strategic goals of perestroyka. The interpretation of the past, the renewal of our concept of socialism, the definition of the main parameters of its new face, ways of achieving a qualitatively new state of Soviet society—all these and other fundamental theoretical problems have been submitted by the party for extensive discussion. Scientists and practical workers have done an enormous amount of work during the perestroyka years.

There was not, is not, and cannot be any question of dreaming up a fraudulent picture of the future and then imposing it on life. The future does not grow out of dreams about it, but out of the present, out of the contradictions and development trends inherent in the present, out of our common work. To forget this would mean indulging in hare-brained schemes.

Some people have been trying to rebuke us for not having a clear-cut, detailed plan for implementing the perestroyka concept. One can hardly agree with that attitude to the issue. I believe that we would be making a theoretical mistake if we started once again imposing ready-made scenarios on society and forcing life and actual reality to fit into the "Procrustean bed" of those scenarios. That was a feature of Stalinism, which is not our way. We work on the basis of Lenin's ideas. And working on the basis of Lenin's ideas means investigating how the future will grow out of present reality, and constructing our plans on that basis.

That is precisely what we are doing. Look at our approaches of even 2 years ago and compare them with our current approaches. Any unbiased person can see the dynamics of the views and the progress that has been made. We have learned a great deal in this time. We have understood a great deal, and we have seen our own shortcomings too. And today we are radically and gradually changing the forms of the organization of society's life. We realize that we need to accelerate this work still further. But not to the detriment of the content and quality of the reforms—be they in the economic sphere, the political sphere, or in the regulation of ethnic relations.

Well, what alternative concepts are being suggested? There are none as such. We can only talk about two viewpoints which are most clearly heard today. One view is that the administrative-edict system, strict planning, and edicts not only in the economy but in culture should be retained. The other view is based on the idea that our past path allegedly amounted to a complete reversal of the October option and so proposes that society turn to capitalism. Could we follow these routes? No, we reject them. The arguments on this score are well-known. We can see a different route—a route leading to social progress.

Today we are facing the complex task of reviving the prestige of Marxist thinking and the Marxist approach to reality. In further elaborating the concept and policy of perestroyka and in understanding the problems of developing socialism we need the entire wealth of Marxist methodology, philosophy, and the valuable tenets of one of the world's most influential ideologies.

Socialism will still have to gain an appropriate understanding of itself in line with the profound meaning imbued in it as an idea from the very beginning. And, of course, in the context of the present-day stage of the development of human civilization. After all, the seven decades since October are a historically short timespan for the actual formation of a new society marking the start of a new era in human progress. And we see perestroyka as a protracted stage of socialism's historic path during which the authoritarian and bureaucratic system will be rejected and a genuinely democratic and self-governing social organism will be formed.

Diverse elements and factors are combining, interweaving, and collaborating in this fundamentally revolutionary transitional period. A new quality of social life and a new face of socialism are crystallizing out of the competition between different economic and social forms and institutions and different ideological trends. The formation of developing socialism is a process which will go beyond the bounds of decades, into the 21st century.

We must look to the future boldly and openly. Restructuring our society, we are relying on the gigantic intellectual and moral potential inherent in the socialist idea of building a humane, free, and intelligent society, which is associated for us with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

II. Marxism-Leninism and the Theory of Socialism

History has acutely raised the question of the vitality of the socialist idea itself. It is no longer sufficient to claim that it accords with the logic of the historical process or the centuries-long aspirations of working people. Today voices are increasingly heard claiming that the socialist idea is an artificial and speculative construction which has therefore lost the future, and that the Marxist theory which it expresses and substantiates has failed since it is responsible for the crisis in our society.

This subject, in view of its fundamental, theoretical, and practical importance, requires serious analysis.

The socialist idea has a long history. It has inspired many social and revolutionary movements for centuries. Marx and Engels, profoundly imbued with the socialist idea, freed it from utopian illusions and ludicrousness by presenting scientific socialism as a natural product of the progress of civilization and the historic creativity of the working class and the working people's masses. At the same time, they clearly differentiated it from crude, egalitarian, "barrack-room" (Marx) communism, linking the formation of a new society with the supreme development of material production, democracy, and the individual.

This interpretation of the socialist idea is a supreme social and spiritual asset. Central to it are people and their comprehensive material, intellectual, and moral development in a society freed from exploitation and oppression. We believe that during this period social thinking in the main has neither rejected nor exceeded the Marxist idea of building a "realm of freedom" based on people's control of material production and their own social relations.

The founders of Marxism never got around to inventing the specific forms and mechanisms for the development of a new society. They worked out the socialist idea, relying on real social life and the practice of the revolutionary workers' movement of their time. They demonstrated the historically transient nature of capitalism and the historical need for a transition to a new level of social development, striving to give revolutionary social forces a theoretically grounded "slogan for the struggle" for socialism. The classics provided merely a common theoretical model of the trends of social development, which serves as a reliable guideline in the recognition and transformation of social practice. As for building a future society to replace capitalism, they discussed it merely in the most general terms and mainly from the standpoint of its main principles.

It is clear that the founders of Marxism and the theory they created cannot be held responsible for the deformations in socialism during the personality cult and stagnation years, or for the erroneous actions of certain political figures. Not only because their theory is separated from these events by the barrier of a century, but also because of the essence of their work.

This applies, in particular, to certain widespread interpretations of Marxism. For instance, it is believed that the negative attitude to commodity production which has become established in our country over the decades comes directly from Marx, who believed that with the transition from private to public ownership the law of cost would lose its capacity to be the regulator of production. But Marx linked the overcoming of commodity production not only with social ownership but with a supreme level of development in production forces, when a "self-reproducing production process" is formed between man and nature resulting in man's no longer being a direct participant in material production.

This is based on the development of science and technology, and to an extent not yet achieved anywhere in the world. Naturally, such a level of the development of production forces is typical not of the early stages of the new formation, in which we currently find ourselves, but of its distant future. And if a rejection of commodity-money relations is imposed on our ravaged country and if people switch to direct exchange of goods at a time when there are general shortages of the most basic necessities—as was the case during the war communism period—can such an application of theory really be laid at the door of the creators of the theory and the theory itself? We will still have to investigate why V.I. Lenin's assessment of the early attempts, in the war communism period, to assert socialism by switching to direct exchanges of goods as a mistake went unnoticed (cf. V.I. Lenin, *Complete Collected Works*, Vol. 44, pp. 157-158; 194; 204-205).

We can now say that Marx underestimated the capacity for self-development displayed by capitalism, which was able to assimilate the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, to set up socioeconomic structures which would ensure its vitality, and to create a relatively high level of prosperity for most of the population in the developed capitalist countries—which, of course, does not eradicate its profound internal contradictions.

Although Marx was the first to see the immense potential of development in scientific and technical progress and the transformation of science into a direct production

and social force, he did not predict that a future scientific and technical revolution could be a new source of capitalist development. This is easy to understand if one bears in mind the fact that Marx was merely forecasting the potential development of the 19th-century capitalism known to him. He did not envisage a prolonged coexistence of the two social systems in major groups of countries—forcing capitalism to improve itself, to become receptive to important elements of socialist experience in the socioeconomic sphere, and to democratize the political system, which, taken together, allowed capitalism to acquire additional strength and adapt to the challenges of the time.

Moreover, new problems have been acutely visible in our time which were either not visible in the past—and therefore could not be analyzed by the classics—or existed only in embryonic form. The nature of capitalist ownership has changed considerably. As has its structure—particularly now, in connection with the internationalization of production and the tendency of the capitalist economy as a whole to transcend national boundaries. Global problems have exacerbated to such an extent that, without them, it is now impossible to gain a realistic impression of modern trends in social development or of mankind's future.

Finally, there is the world experience of socialism, on which we can rely in determining our development goals. Today we have a broader, more profound, and more realistic understanding of socialism than we had in the recent past. We realize that it is a world process in which different strands of socialist thinking in the rest of the world and social movements different in their composition and motivation can take their place alongside the socialist countries, which are at different levels of socioeconomic and political development.

Socialism is just as diverse in its manifestations as life itself. Since it is the living creation of the people's masses in their millions. That is why different varieties of socialist development are inevitable even in each individual society. This is all the more true on the level of the entire world community. Diversity is conditioned by different levels in the development of social production forces and by the uniqueness of each people's historic, ethnic, and cultural traditions.

We approach the experience of social democracy from this standpoint too. We can see and make a value judgment on its century-long contribution to the development of socialist values and the implementation of social reforms which have helped to improve the prosperity and social protection enjoyed by working people in many Western capitalist countries. We are studying with interest the rich and multifaceted, although ambiguous, experience amassed by social democracy, and striving to draw from it whatever is appropriate for our society's conditions.

The fact that Marxism, developing the socialist idea, presented socialism as the natural product of the progress of civilization and the historic creativity of the people is of abiding importance. This reflects its scientific approach to the substantiation of the new society. But, in order to retain this approach, it is important to remember that it is not provided once and for all.

III. The Socialist Idea and Socialist Practice

1. Lenin: "Changing Our Whole View of Socialism"

When talking about the future, we inevitably refer to the past. The question of the route for our future development to take is indissolubly linked with the assessment of October. No revolution follows a previously compiled plan, no revolution ever produces exactly the results its participants expected—that is shown by the entire experience of human history. This also applies to the socialist revolution, which the classics of Marxism repeatedly talked about. "Ready-made opinions about the details of organizing a future society? You will not find even the slightest hint of them in our work," F. Engels said (K. Marx, F. Engels. *Works*. Vol 22, p 563). V.I. Lenin wrote the following about progress toward the implementation of the rule "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs": "We do not know and cannot know the stages and practical measures which mankind will use to reach this supreme goal" (*Complete Collected Works*, Vol 33, p 99). And this was stated after February and on the threshold of October. It was stated in "The State and Revolution"—a book containing the most detailed of all descriptions of the socialist future which he permitted himself before the start of revolutionary practice.

Needless to say, this does not mean that the real results of revolution, both immediate and remote, are not subject to political and scientific assessment and reassessment. This reassessment is constantly taking place as experience is built up. And if we associate the greatest progressive changes in the country and the world over the past 72 years with October—and we are quite right to do so—we cannot avoid asking to what extent the violations of socialist legality, infringements of citizens' democratic rights, and other negative phenomena have become possible under the conditions of the new social system.

Yes, our past is ambiguous. It includes victories and defeats, discoveries and mistakes, the glorious and the tragic, revolutionary enthusiasm, heroic labor and victims, great hopes and disappointments. We cannot reject our history. The roots of many of our problems today are to be found in the past. The entire experience of socialism—both heroic and tragic—is a human asset. It must all be studied and analyzed in depth. In this case not only our victories but our losses will not be in vain, we will get a better understanding of the dangers awaiting us and how to avoid them.

Now, as we probe more deeply into the essence of our own history, it is becoming more and more obvious that the October Revolution was not a mistake—and not only

because the real alternative to it was not a bourgeois democratic republic, as some people try to argue even now, but anarchic riots, a bloody military dictatorship, and the assertion of a reactionary, antipeople regime.

There is no doubt that the October Revolution was not an accident but a great breakthrough to the future in world history, a declaration of intent as regards solving social problems in the interests of the people, creating social conditions for supreme material and spiritual progress, and including the entire mass of working people in the process of conscientious social creation.

The years after October were the first practical test for the socialist idea. An intensive search for specific forms of social organization began. This is shown above all by the works of V.I. Lenin, beginning with his famous work "The Next Tasks for Soviet Power." Under the influence of the dogmatic instructions which were implanted by Stalin and long outlived him, we have underestimated the questing nature of V.I. Lenin's work after October and have drawn a veil over the changes in his views of the building of socialism, since these changes could allegedly have been interpreted as weakness. In actual fact Lenin's questing was a sign of strength, not weakness. In the thick of events and turbulent cataclysms Lenin was able to learn from life, to sensitively grasp the needs of the masses, to generalize facts, and to draw theoretical conclusions from the processes taking place in society.

There is also a widely held impression that Lenin allegedly had a complete program for building socialism in our country. In actual fact he had no such complete program. It is well known that in the first years of the revolution emphasis was placed on direct distribution, compulsory labor, strict accounting, and controls—measures which became an organic element in the policy of war communism. But with the end of the Civil War it became clear to Lenin that this policy was exhausted. It was impossible to encourage the masses to embrace socialism relying purely on the enthusiasm generated by the revolution; it was necessary to bring into play a material interest and concomitant economic mechanisms of commodity production and trading. On this basis the main directions of the movement of society were redefined, chief among them the courageous proclamation of the New Economic Policy—a policy which cut across dogmatic directives and the public opinion prevailing within the party.

The following problem was no less dramatic. In the period of the preparations for the October Revolution and during its implementation V.I. Lenin and the Bolsheviks were hoping for support from the proletariat in the more developed countries, since they realized that Russia had not reached the level of economic development needed for the transition to socialism. However, by the time the Civil War ended there had been no victorious proletarian revolution in other countries. Did this mean that power should not have been seized in October or that it should have been abandoned after the Civil War? Lenin gives a clear answer: We need to use the power of the proletariat to rapidly create the economic and cultural prerequisites for the transition to socialism—that is, the creation of a modern industry and the implementation of revolution in the sphere of culture. In other words, to do what should have been done by capitalism and bourgeois democracy. But to do it under Soviet power.

By the end of his life V.I. Lenin had created the initial outlines of his cooperative plan and closely linked the idea of the cultural revolution with the cooperativization of small producers and with changes in all living conditions. Thus, V.I. Lenin had elaborated his program for the transition to socialism, which constituted a change—as he clearly recognized—in "our whole view of socialism."

Analysis of all his post-October work put together makes it possible to realize the direction which he envisaged this change taking. And we probably learn most about this from the article "On the Cooperative System," in which the words quoted above are to be found. From the idea oft-repeated in 1917-1918 of a "single factory"—a kind of monopoly on the running of a workers' state—he moved toward the idea that the socialist system is a "system of civilized cooperative members."

How all this was to be brought about and what organizational and other social forms it would take were problems that V.I. Lenin did not have time to work on. He only created the outlines and approaches to the problem. Unfortunately, even these were subsequently either ignored or blatantly distorted during Stalin's industrialization and collectivization.

Why did Stalin succeed in imposing his program and his methods on the party and all of society? This is the major question for an assessment of our history.

2. Bureaucratic Deformations of the Socialist Idea

The search for forms and methods of building a new society that was historically necessary after Lenin turned into a fierce ideological and political struggle. Stalin played skillfully on the revolutionary intolerance of the masses, on the utopian and egalitarian trends inherent in any mass movement, and on the vanguard's desire for the speediest achievement of their desired goal. All this greatly restricted the opportunity for a creative discussion of emerging problems and alternatives, and it led to a unification in which there was no longer any room for diverse opinions and views based on Marxist theory and held within the framework of the party program. The socialist idea was brought ever more closely into line with the image of an authoritarian, bureaucratic-edict, administrative system.

The other consequence of this process was the increasing gap between Marxist theory and reality and between humanist ideals and practice. The bureaucratic, strictly centralized economic and political system operated according to its own laws. And theory had to carry out a distorted ideological function, creating the illusion of the

"correctness" of these actions, justifying practice, and depicting in public awareness a finished model of socialism that allegedly corresponded to Marxist-Leninist principles.

Any means—however inhuman—were justified for the sake of achieving this "great goal." "Political expediency" was officially placed above "formal legality"—which deprived politics of its moral basis. Flouting the norms and principles of human morality and justice, the authoritarian and bureaucratic system strove to strengthen its position, persistently introducing into social awareness "special" norms of communal life and behavior that differed from common human norms.

At the same time, despite all the deformations, the people retained a humanist concept of socialism deep in their consciousness and strove to promote it at every opportunity.

The 20th CPSU Congress, its unmasking of the phenomena dubbed the "personality cult," its dethronement of Stalin, and its condemnation of his methods were of immense importance. This forced people to take a fresh look at the path traveled by the country and the party.

But the 20th Congress, while rejecting and condemning the dark aspects and excesses of the Stalin regime, left the bureaucratic system itself generally unchanged. It was able to survive, helped by the new illusion that it was enough to remove the excesses of the Stalin regime for the liberated energy of socialism to bring our society to the supreme phase of communism in the very near future.

The assessment of the state reached by society as "developed socialism" contained elements of pragmatism. However, this too contained too great a proportion of utopianism and exaggeration—and the main thing was that the same old bureaucratic system survived.

Stalin's distortions led to the loss of the main asset in the Marxist and Leninist concept of socialism: the concept of people as an end rather than a means. Instead of the idea of the free development of each individual as the condition for the free development of all there appeared an idea of people as "cogs" in the party and state machine and of working people's organizations as the "drive belts" of this machine. And the prevailing mechanism was basically retained subsequently as well. Moreover, the administrative and bureaucratic system essentially acquired greater strength—with extremely negative consequences for society, which ultimately found itself mired in stagnation and on the brink of a crisis.

These years are usually called the "stagnation period," but clearly this description is inadequate. It was a time of lost opportunities that seriously damaged the socialist cause. The importance of the breakthrough in science and technology was underestimated and practical steps were not taken in this direction, even though there was a lot of talk about the need to combine the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution—and the latest stage of it, at that—with the advantages of socialism. As a result, in terms of general civilization we were left in a past technological era in a number of important spheres and avenues, while the Western countries were switching to a new era—the era of high technology, of fundamentally new relationships between science and production, and of new forms of providing for people's lives, including their everyday lifestyle.

Many people are now trying to seek the roots of our present troubles and difficulties in the socialist option itself. Not in the route taken by the revolution but in its initial premise and principles. The CPSU too is going back to the sources and principles of the revolution, not to debunk the "foolhardiness of the brave" but to fully shoulder responsibility for the cause of the revolution and for its promises, achievements, and debts. The party, as the organizer of the revolution, should remember those debts. Without this, further progress down the socialist path will be impossible. What was left undone or incomplete should be carried out and completed.

Marxist theory foresaw the possibility that during the building of the new society it would often be necessary to redo everything from the beginning.

3. Perestroyka and the New Vision of Socialism

Revolutionary perestroyka began on the initiative of the party and its leadership. On these grounds our press has sometimes assessed it as a "revolution from above" and drawn various historical parallels and comparisons.

However, I think that the concept of a "revolution from above" is unacceptable because it divides our society into a leading "elite" and "lower orders" which carry out its ideas, instructions, and commands. For Stalin, who used this concept in characterizing collectivization, it was natural since it reflected his notion of the pyramid of power whose bottom is the "lower orders" and whose top is the leaders. But for us this notion is a copy of the authoritarian-bureaucratic system which we reject and is an expression of the antidemocratic ideology of Stalinism, that is, of the old thinking, not the new.

Perestroyka is an integral revolutionary process implemented by democratic methods, by the people and for the people, in relation to whom the party acts as their political vanguard. And the activeness and historical initiatives displayed by the party are a natural expression of its vanguard role. Also the party does not monopolize the right to quest. Perestroyka needs any useful initiative, whatever its source, for its vitality depends politically on the development of democracy, whose function, in particular, is to stimulate the people's initiative.

Today it is more important than ever to provide an answer to the question of new approaches to socialism and the new vision of its basic characteristics.

Perestroyka transfers the original principles of the revolution into the category of real principles, for in the past for the most part they were merely proclaimed. At the

same time it has now emerged quite definitely that these principles and the criteria of socialistness based on them need to be concretized in the light of the experience of world socialism and development processes in the capitalist countries.

Above all, they must be freed from overtones of confrontational attitudes, of absolute, metaphysical confrontation between contemporary social systems. Life itself and its dialectics, which have confronted mankind with global problems and dangers, require a transition from confrontation to cooperation among peoples and states irrespective of their social system.

The overcoming of the confrontational approach is facilitated by consideration of the fact that we are part of human civilization and are responsible for its preservation. However, in the fever of our direct opposition to capitalism we clearly underestimated the importance of much that had been developed by mankind over the centuries. These achievements of civilization include not only simple norms of morality and justice, but also principles of formal law, that is, the equality of all before the law, individual rights and freedoms, and the principles of commodity production and equivalent exchange founded on the operation of the law of value. The thought that at the present level of socialism's development commodity production and economic management methods are an integral element of it is now increasingly clearly becoming part of the public awareness.

We should also take a fresh look at V.I. Lenin's well known thesis that there are no intermediate "constructs" between the level called monopoly capitalism and the level called socialism. Clearly, Lenin revealed a closeness which we have still not fully grasped between the forms of organization and level of socialization of production in these formations testifying that what are operating here are not purely formation-specific mechanisms but mechanisms common to all civilization. Our understanding of the content of the economic competition between capitalism and socialism must change. What assumes decisive significance is not the quantitative production growth or the quantity of products per capita (although this task too remains on the agenda in some sectors of the national economy, agriculture, for instance) but the saving of resources, the level of technology, and information provision. We must change economic criteria and bring them into line with contemporary reality, with the economic reality of our time. And this is very essential for defining the goals of economic policy.

Thus we lead the world in terms of total production of steel, mineral fertilizers, and certain other types of output. And does this achievement give us anything specifically "socialist"? Clearly, at a certain point these tonnes, articles, meters, and so forth become overly crude and primitive indicators of economic and social development. In these conditions criteria of socialism must be more closely correlated with people's interests and needs. And in the sphere of the production of material wealth we should follow not the confrontational slogan of "catching up and passing" but the orientation of more organic inclusion in the world process of economic development. We will gain economically if we do not oppose others in this sphere but seek to resolve our own economic problems together with them.

It is also obvious that both under capitalism and under socialism processes take place whose content is extremely similar, since they stem ultimately from the development of modern productive forces and from scientific and technical progress. I am referring, in particular, to processes of integration. Of course, we must not mimic the West, but we should make greater use of the advantages of integration processes than is being done at present within the framework of the world socialist system.

What do we see as the essence and content of the criterion of socialistness, what values do we seek to carefully preserve and to enrich with new facets?

The idea of socialism, as we understand it today, is above all the idea of freedom. The founders of scientific socialism inextricably linked the chief motive of social revolution—the liberation of the working class—with the liberation of "all mankind" from any forms of oppression and exploitation (see K. Marx, F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 19, p 246). And it was a question of a freedom based on human reason, on humanist notions of the rights of the individual living among other people, of a freedom that has nothing in common with anarchy or with selfish and destructive willfulness. That is why the socialist understanding of freedom is organically combined with the ideas of commonality and collectiveness. But not a barracks collectiveness that levels the individual, but what Marx and Engels called real collectiveness under which "individuals gain freedom in their association and by means of it" (ibid, Vol 3, p 75).

Unfortunately, it is precisely this aspect of the socialist idea that has been subjected to greatest distortion. In the name of a misconceived collectivism human individuality was ignored, individual development was retarded, reasonable limits of freedom were sharply narrowed on the pretext of the priority of the common over the individual, and the humane essence of the socialist social structure was watered down. In other words, the socialist ideal lost the main thing—people themselves, their needs, interests, and real life.

Immediately after the revolution a well known poetic formula emerged: "Socialism is the free labor of freely assembled people." Life and practice made the formula more specific: "Not directly on enthusiasm, but with the help of the enthusiasm born of the great revolution, on personal interest, on a personal stake, on economic accountability"—those were the principles on which the process of socialist building should be based, according to Lenin. This truth too was long forgotten in conditions where the authoritarian-bureaucratic system was dominant.

Another most important principle of socialism was also interpreted in a distorted, primitive fashion—the principle of the socialization of production in practice. It was precisely practice that was replaced by mere form, rhetoric, and a sham satisfactory situation based on diktat, administration by decree, and often violence, as during the accelerated collectivization of the countryside. Today we must take a more specific view of social ownership, taking into account both positive and negative experience. Above all, it is a question of not reducing socialization to statization, which Lenin warned against, though this was subsequently ignored.

We are not abandoning and will not abandon the very idea of socialization or the priority of social ownership, which is an organic component part of the socialist ideal. United and emancipated labor was and remains the essential feature of socialism. At the same time we reject purely formal socialization and affirm in practice a diversity of forms of ownership that have not exhausted their potential and are capable of advancing the socialist economy along the path of enhancing efficiency.

The strength of the socialist ideal also lies in the fact that within it the problems of efficiency and labor productivity are inseparable from humanism and social justice. The center of gravity of the socialist idea and its specific distinction lie here. And this is the strength, not the weakness of the socialist social structure, as people sometimes think, unless humanism is confused with the encouragement of freeloading and justice with total leveling and the absence of any differentiation at all.

Unfortunately, the crudely leveling notions that were criticized by Marx are still quite widespread in public opinion. Even today many people are still under the thumb of such sentiments. The justice of socialism is closely connected with the problem of distribution according to labor, which in turn cannot be resolved without profound analysis of the problems of labor productivity in general, of the real correlation between simple and complex labor, and of the combination of society's current and long-term interests. That is a task for today and at the same time for the strategic future. This is precisely the contradiction of socialism that acts as a powerful motive force for its development.

An essential feature of socialism is the establishment of genuine people's power. No one has ever denied this in all the years of our history. The involvement of the masses in management has always been regarded as a most important token of socialist democracy, whose development, according to Lenin, should be as follows: from democracy for the working people, as culture progresses and the level of the masses' consciousness rises, it should turn into democracy implemented by the working people themselves. The declaration of our socialist state to be a state of the whole people at the turn of the fifties and sixties clearly ought to have been a milestone marking this transition. Unfortunately, for several decades theoretical innovations were not accompanied by any changes in political mechanisms. Therefore, like ownership relations, socialist democracy should be viewed not in the abstract but in unity with the mechanisms for embodying its basic principles, mechanisms that are called upon to ensure socialist self-management by the people and a rule-of-law state. The consistent implementation of these principles represents a guarantee of not only democratic but genuinely socialist development of our political system. This is one of the lessons of the past and a task dictated to us by life and the reality of perestroyka.

Socialism is the bearer and defender of general democratic and general human ideals and values. The question of the essence of the class approach in conditions of the priority of the general human values affirmed by the modern era assumes exceptionally great importance in this connection. Right from the start of the formation of the proletarian movement Marx stressed the fact that "the struggle to liberate the working class means a struggle not for class privileges and monopolies but for equal rights and duties and for the destruction of any class domination" (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. 16, p 12). Thus the vector of the class principle coincided with the direction of civilization's progress along the road toward freedom and peace.

But at the same time we cannot manage without an effective class analysis of the realities of life, the present state of society, and its motive forces and contradictions. Only given careful consideration of the interests and needs of our society's classes and groups can we build a realistic policy even in the course of perestroyka, which is called upon to overcome the distortions of socialism and to bring it to a qualitatively new level.

IV. The New Face of Socialism

Now we are approaching the main question raised at the beginning: Where are we going? What meaning should be invested in the concept of a new quality of society and a new face of socialism? Here too the very approach to the question and the methodology behind its analysis are important.

K. Marx once wrote that communism is not an ideal but a real movement of society itself that removes its former content. But, despite this idea, our efforts were focused on describing some kind of ideal "model" of the future, to which changes in society were tailored. An abstract schema was imposed on reality not only in theory but in practice too. However, life often took a different path, in accordance with objective conditions. But the desire to force it to move in line with a readymade schema led to dogmatism, ideological brutality, narrow-mindedness [zakrytost], self-deception, and tyranny over people and history.

The people are tired of waiting. There have been too many groundless appeals and promises for them to be able to believe unreservedly any more. A great deal was said about people's interests, but this talk was rarely

backed up with material resources and real action. As a result, although it became a great and mighty power, the country did not create for the mass of people the living conditions natural for any civilized state. This paradox of one-sided development must be eradicated by perestroyka in the course of the creation of a qualitatively new state of society geared to humanistic socialist values. By creating the conditions for a full life for present generations of people, we are safeguarding our country's future and socialism's future.

When the question is raised in this way ideas about the new face of socialism form naturally in the process of revealing and theoretically interpreting the fundamental needs and interests of today's people. Goals and programs adequate to present-day reality but simultaneously geared to the future can be formulated on this basis.

The new face of socialism is a human face—which is wholly in line with the ideas of Marx, for whom the society of the future would be real humanism implemented in practice. And since its creation is the main aim of perestroyka, we can say with every justification that we are building **humane socialism**.

Our task, of course, is not to simply proclaim this concept. It is important to renew socialism in practice, creating socioeconomic and political structures—which are the means, while people are the end—which really ensure that the entire social system is geared to people. This humanization of social structures accords not only with the demands of love of one's fellow man or moral imperatives. It is now becoming an economic and social necessity for our society and a requirement for its development.

Perestroyka has shown that only the real inclusion of people as responsible subjects of activity in all state and social affairs will make it possible to overcome people's alienation and the gap between common and personal interests and to heighten the individual's activeness in all spheres of social life.

On the other hand, the humanization of social structures can only happen if our investment in people is increased. We need to finally realize that society will develop more intensively if people themselves are more developed, competent, and conscientious in their work. That is why investment in people is the most profitable use of capital. And in this respect we seriously lag behind the developed states, where the proportion of financing given over to public education, health care, and other spheres of human services constitutes a far higher proportion of national income than in our country. We need a radical turnaround in this area, a rejection in actions rather than words of the leftover principle for financing these spheres, since only this kind of an approach is in line with fundamental socialist values.

Perestroyka has dictated this to us, and, in determining the future and the new face of socialism, we must implement to the full the principle of the priority of the human dimension in all spheres of our society's life.

In the **economic sphere** the change in our view of socialism has led to a realization that in order to achieve progress in modern productive forces and to boost social labor productivity we need to develop diverse forms of socialist ownership and create new economic mechanisms for implementing it which are efficiently organized and provide incentives for people's labor activity.

During these transformations we have no need to reject the generally recognized advantages of centralism and large-scale planning. We reject bureaucratic centralism in favor of democratic centralism—thereby rejecting a purely formal and essentially impotent centralism in favor of a real and effective version. Departmental pseudocentralism must give way to reliable management mechanisms with the help of voluntary associations of labor collectives.

The economic mechanisms being shaped by perestroyka will produce the proper results if working people become the real subjects of ownership, if workers become the owners of the means of labor, if peasants become masters of the land, and if these mechanisms themselves represent not only social interests but—in harmony with them—working people's own interests too, so as to enable people to see the link between the results of their work and the rewards they receive for it.

In the process of this transformation there will undoubtedly also be a profound structural reorientation of the economy, first, through the **conversion** of defense sector enterprises—the road to which is being opened up by the processes of strengthening international security, disarmament, and the transition to a nuclear-free world—and, second, through a considerable increase in the proportion of means of consumption within the overall volume of output.

There is one other highly important aspect to structural perestroyka, and here too our tasks lie in the mainstream of the quest being undertaken by all mankind. In the second half of the 20th century the futility of the old model of industrialization which swallows up huge amounts of natural resources and requires ever-increasing amounts of raw and other materials and energy sources has become obvious. Such a wasteful economic structure could only develop for a limited time in a limited part of the world. It is not suitable for all mankind for very long—nature is simply not up to it.

Unfortunately, socialism was unable to occupy the position of leader of structural perestroyka—this role is today played by the industrially developed capitalist countries. Happy to have avoided the social upheavals connected with the energy crisis of the seventies in the capitalist world, we were too late in noticing that the social upheavals there were followed by a vigorous structural perestroyka based on high technology and savings of energy and raw materials. Today we are paying for our sluggishness and self-confidence, and our

payment includes social costs too. Life obliges us to reaffirm the advantages of our system at the level of social perestroyka.

This is a task of no less scale and complexity than our high-speed industrialization or the organization of industry for victory during the war years. It is also a task of no less importance, since we are talking about the country's vital interests and destiny.

Perestroyka will win if it wins economically—that is, if we ensure economic stability, the proper growth in labor productivity, and the acceleration of the pace of scientific and technical progress. These features should typify the new economic face of socialism.

In **terms of politics**, the renewal of socialism is leading to the provision of genuine people's power through the formation of the mechanisms of a civil society and a rule-of-law state.

We usually used to take a negative attitude to the very term "democratic socialism," which was identified with the expression of a reformist and opportunistic line in the socialist movement. Now we are talking about the democratization not only of the state system but of all of social life—a democratization that is a powerful incentive for increasing and creating the conditions for the masses' social activeness and independent activity.

The idea of building a socialist rule-of-law state, an idea which means the supremacy of the law, the granting to each individual of a wide range of social and political rights and freedoms in conjunction with a high degree of responsibility and discipline, and the creation of effective management mechanisms, is organically linked with the development of democracy.

Democracy and freedom are great values of human civilization which we have inherited and are filling with socialist content. We advocate real democracy, but we oppose the rejection on this basis of the formal principles of democracy, since a rule-of-law state of necessity embodies these principles, and our own experience suggests how important strict observance of all legal principles is in society's life. That is why we have every justification for saying that we are building not only humane but **democratic socialism**.

The dialectical combination of the idea and practice of the socialist self-management of the people (with its advantages such as the utilization of the possibilities afforded by direct democracy, and active participation by citizens in the running of all society's affairs through diverse channels of direct public expression) with mechanisms of representative parliamentary democracy tested by the experience of many years and guaranteeing a clear separation of the executive and the legislature and the independence of the courts is the leading trend in the development of the state and other political institutions.

The socialist self-management of the people presupposes a sensible demarcation of "spheres of influence" between state and various social structures and institutions of civil society, and at the same time the "germination" of self-management principles within Soviet statehood, which will be promoted by the development of the entire system of soviets of people's deputies.

A special role in the new social organism is played by the Communist Party, which is called upon to be the political vanguard of Soviet society. The fate of perestroyka—and, consequently, the achievement of a qualitatively new state of society and a new face of socialism—depends to an enormous, if not decisive, extent on its activity.

Perestroyka has set the party a twofold task: on the one hand, determining its place in conditions of the fundamental democratization of the political system, the building of a civil society, and the transition to economic accountability and economic management methods in the national economy, and, on the other hand, implementing perestroyka within the party itself. All these are new and complex problems. Developing the masses' independent activity and the processes of the democratization of all social life within the framework of the one-party system is a noble and difficult mission for the party. And the way in which we fulfill that mission will determine a great deal.

Today, ridding itself of its operational executive and managerial functions, the party is turning into a center for the elaboration of political and ideological platforms recommended to society and the state in the shape of its elective organs. The party's job is to interpret these processes, to define and suggest policies, and to carry out forecasting activity by expanding theoretical work based on Marxist-Leninist principles and values and analysis of the realities of our existence and world experience. The CPSU influences the processes taking place in society through its multifaceted practical work among the masses, operating through party organizations and Communists. The party's task is to head the resolution of the task bequeathed to us by Lenin of combating bureaucratism in the management apparatus and consistently pursuing this struggle at all stages of perestroyka.

This change in party functions also provides a new definition of its place in the political system as the ideological, political, and moral vanguard of the people. Organizationally, the party, without "issuing commands" to state and social structures, must retain its independence and operate within the framework of the constitution and other Soviet laws. At the current complex stage the interests of consolidating society and focusing all its healthy forces on the resolution of the difficult tasks of perestroyka dictate the expediency of retaining the one-party system. But the party will nonetheless promote the development of pluralism and competing opinions in society and the expansion of glasnost in the interests of democracy and the people. In the struggle for the renewal of socialism the party cannot yield the initiative to populist demagoguery, nationalistic or chauvinistic currents, or unruly group interests.

The party has also embarked on the path of restructuring itself. Its internal structure and its working style and methods are changing. But, unfortunately, perestroyka within the party is still proceeding more slowly than in society as a whole, which is creating substantial difficulties in ensuring the party's vanguard role. The party is fully resolved to embark on the path of radical renewal so as to become in practice an example of democratization in which new forms and procedures of self-management will be worked out, the principles of collectivism and comradeship developed, and the rights of organization members implemented on the basis of conscientious discipline. The structure and functions of the party apparatus will have to be brought into line with the new conditions, the activity of all party links will have to be restructured, and conservatism and dogmatism will have to be overcome.

The process of the renewal of socialism is becoming increasingly profound and thorough in the **social sphere**. In the broad sense of the word, this constitutes the sphere of social production of people themselves, with their interests and the manifestations of these interests in various forms of social relations [obshcheniye]. This includes daily life, the service sphere, education, public health, social security, and the field of leisure, that is, the sum total of all social transformations aimed at serving man's requirements.

By concentrating attention on the superficially conceived management of material production, the command system reduced the social sphere to a state of neglect and even partial degradation. We are now directly aware that our attitude to the social sphere was also one of the factors of stagnation and a cause of the increase in social tension whose fruits we are reaping today.

Although social programs are now the center of the perestroyka policy, we are only beginning to bring them into line with man's requirements and socialist principles. We still have to get rid of both individual groups' freeloading demands on the state and the practice of foisting bureaucratic notions of the socialist way of life on people. Qualitative transformations must be effected here and they are an organic part of our notions of the present and future of socialist society and its revolutionary renewal by means of perestroyka.

Perestroyka is raising the question of the **dynamics of society's social structure** in a new way. It is obvious that our former notion of society's increasing social uniformity as socialism develops is one-sided. The diverse socialist forms of ownership that are arising to replace the single state form of ownership mean that an increase in social uniformity in one respect will be accompanied by an increase in differentiation in another.

In our ideas of socialist society now and in the future we must, obviously, consider very thoroughly the specific nature of peasant labor as labor on the land which deals with living nature and willnever completely be a variety of industrial labor. That is why the process of overcoming the old social division of labor between the city and the countryside and wiping out the differences between the working class and the peasantry is not proving to be as simple, straightforward, and immediate a prospect as it previously seemed.

Now it is in practice a question of reviving rather than eliminating the countryside, of bringing it closer to the city in terms of cultural and everyday conditions, and of extensively constructing highways and developing transport systems which increase rural inhabitants' mobility, along with their ability to maintain constant links with the city. We must study the processes in the relationship between the city and the countryside taking place under the influence of progressive economic and cultural factors.

Perestroyka has literally brought to the surface of public life a mass of problems and contradictions in the **sphere of interethnic relations**. These problems did not spring up today. They arose when the national principle was suppressed and the "nationalities question" was proclaimed to be resolved. These problems became most strained when it was deemed possible to punish whole peoples for an unknown crime. These conflicts have merely surfaced under the current conditions of democracy and glasnost; this must be examined in a sober fashion, since we cannot solve the real problems without finding out what they are. It is important only to seek to ensure that national movements defending their sovereignty, economy, and culture do not damage other nations, our entire union, or perestroyka.

Often phenomena with general social rather than national roots appear as interethnic contradictions. These phenomena include departmentalism, which complicates economic development in all regions. Bureaucratism, which violates people's elementary rights. And corrupt elements' resistance to perestroyka. But the agonizing and complex collisions which sometimes even assume a tragic character through the fault of extremists mean that substantial changes are needed in this sphere in the spirit of the genuine values of socialism.

In its platform on nationalities policy the CPSU, proceeding on the basis of a contemporary understanding of the dialectics of national and international processes, tried to reflect to the maximum everything of value voiced in public debate and present a new-look Soviet federation harmoniously combining the interests of national sovereignty and development with the common interests of the union of the country's peoples. Within its framework interethnic relations cannot fail to be based on principles of democracy, equality, mutual respect, and free development of peoples.

Maybe the most radical changes leading to the renewal of socialism must take place in the **sphere of ideology, culture, and education**. Perestroyka is revealing broad scope for the spiritual development of people themselves and the society in which they live and for changes in psychological principles. These include the elaboration

of an attitude to labor in line with society's contemporary tasks, an increase in the level of professionalism and competence, and society's moral cleansing and recovery.

Our notions of the future allot an important role to the intelligentsia, its various detachments, and representatives of the mass intelligentsia professions (teachers, doctors, engineers, scientific workers), and to its creative activity in the sphere of culture and science. In order to correct the deformations of the past decades, it is extremely important above all to resolutely boost social assessment of intellectual labor, knowledge, and high professionalism.

Socialism will not have any intellectual or moral attraction in the eyes of mankind if finds itself somewhere at the rear of the advanced detachments of world science and culture. But that is not the only point. Socialism in general will not have any prospects if we do not create conditions for the creative forces of every individual and the entire people to be realized and for talent, ability, and enterprise to be manifested in all spheres of activity. Fewer departmental establishments and offices and less centralization and hierarchical official pyramids mean more truly creative scientific associations of like-minded people. We do not have the right to continue squandering fresh original ideas, inventions, and discoveries. Competition between schools and trends and international contacts must be normal phenomena in our scientific and cultural life. Only then, by joining in the system of world exchange of experience, will we ourselves become richer and contribute to world development.

However, the best "foreign universities" will do us no good if we are unable over the next few years to create schools—in villages and cities—kitted out with modern equipment and staffed with qualified teachers. Without such schools, without teachers who have once again taken up their proper social position—and we have a long way to go here—the people's most splendid spiritual potential runs the risk of remaining untapped. Knowledge, culture, and intellect are the future.

Thus, the socialism toward which we are advancing in the course of perestroyka is a society dependent on an efficient economy, on the lofty achievements of science, technology, and culture, and on humanized social structures, a society that has democratized all aspects of social life and created conditions for people's active creative life and activity.

At the same time many processes of the renewal of socialism are essentially processes characteristic of all civilization taking place in one form or another in other social environments. Global problems common to everyone are beginning to occupy an increasingly large place in mankind's life. All this gives us grounds for assuming that, while retaining their special features, the different social systems are developing within a framework increasingly bounded by the priority of general human interests, such as peace, security, freedom, and the possibility for every people to determine their destiny. The world of socialism is also advancing toward goals common to all mankind within the framework of a single civilization, without renouncing its own values and priorities, but increasingly developing and improving them by means of revolutionary perestroyka and the building of a truly human society on the basis of the principles of reason and humanism.

Thus at the current stage we are faced with problems that concern the aims of perestroyka and the renewal of socialism in the modern world, problems that accord with the task of adequately realizing the essence of the socialist idea. Here—and this must be emphasized once again—we are not following any abstract dogma foisted on us from outside but are analyzing and generalizing things that are taking shape in life itself as the result of creative activity on the part of millions of people. That is why we still do not know a great deal, but hope to find it out in the course of our analysis of the processes in the life of our society, which has embarked on the historically transitional period of perestroyka. We must do our utmost to support the vigorous inclusion of social scientists and the artistic intelligentsia in this important work for the country. I believe that we have every grounds for hoping that it will be successful and for hoping that we will be able by joint efforts to determine the main outlines of the new look of socialism and thus obtain a theoretically well-founded action program for the future in time for the upcoming 28th CPSU Congress.

Sakharov Calls For End to One-Party System

AU2711133189 Paris AFP in English 1317 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, Nov 27 (AFP)—Soviet deputy and human rights advocate Andrey Sakharov has called for an end to the Communist Party's political monopoly, adding that this would help ensure the irreversibility of perestroyka.

In a recent interview, published Monday by Moscow Radio's INTERFAX news digest, Mr. Sakharov called for the repeal of Article 6 of the Constitution which guarantees the Communist Party's leading political role.

"I think its constitutionally fixed exclusiveness is inadmissible, undemocratic and, judging by everything, undermining the Communist Party's virtual prestige," Mr. Sakharov was quoted as saying.

The former dissident and Nobel Peace Prize winner also suggested that people were growing increasingly suspicious of the leadership and that the government should respond by taking "more radical measures in the social, political and economic areas".

"Until the nation firmly believes that perestroyka is irreversible, no reform can be carried through successfully," he said, speaking of President Mikhail Gorbachev policy of renewal.

He also warned that if people did not see any sign of economic improvement in the coming year, "the country may find itself in a very difficult position."

Mr. Sakharov did not rule out a state of emergency, but suggested that it would prove "suicidal" for the conservative apparatus.

The country as a whole was continuing to move "to the left", regardless of whether Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev was moving "to the right" or not, he added.

The group of radical Inter-Regional deputies, of which Mr. Sakharov is one of the co-chairmen, is due to hold a special meeting this weekend and will likely call for a full-scale debate on Article 6 at the next session of the Congress of People's Deputies, due to begin December 12. [passage omitted]

Prokofyev Interviewed on New Position

LD2711011989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Interview with Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, by Eduard Sagalayev on 26 November in the Moscow TV studio; from the "Seven Days" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Sagalayev] Last week, at a plenum of the Moscow City Party Committee, Yuriy Anatoloyevich Prokofyev was elected first secretary of the largest party organization in the country, that of Moscow. Today, Yuriy Anatoliyevich is a guest on our program. Yuriy Anatoloyevich, let us have a few words about yourself, please.

[Prokofyev] Well, the biographial details were in the newspapers. I am 50 years old. I have completed courses of study at approximately 10 year intervals: in 1962 I graduated from the Automotive Institute, in 1972 from higher political school, and in 1982 I became a candidate of economic sciences. That is my education. I have been in the party for 29 years as a professional. I have been involved in Komsomol, party, and local soviet work almost all my life.

[Sagalayev] Yuriy Anatoliyevich, this may be a rather out of the ordinary or unusual question: Do you believe that the communists of Moscow have made the best choice and selected the most worthy candidate?

[Prokofyev] You know, when I was at the meeting of Party raykom first secretaries I said that there were negative aspects in my candidacy and I did not regard it as unequivocal or irreproachable. First, the fact that I was defeated in the elections of people's deputies of the USSR has its political significance, and the fact that I have not come from the top echelons of power and do not have experience of state work will also complicate the situation. But since confidence has been shown, I will put my whole experience and knowledge, and love of the city toward trying to justify that confidence.

[Sagalayev] Yuriy Anatoliyevich, we have just seen an item from Leningrad. I would like to ask you what may not be a very simple question. As the new leader of the Moscow party organization, how do you evaluate this movement which has begun in our first capital, so to speak, of old Russia?

[Prokofyev] Well, you have put me straight into an awkward position (?by raising the subject of Leningrad). Nonetheless, I know virtually all the slogans people brought to the rally. One cannot fail to agree with many of them. The rally was obviously in support of the Party, but what is important is what kind of party it was in support of. If it is a party that is developing, improving itself and becoming more democratic, then this can be understood, but if it is an appeal for a move backwards to previous positions, then it will only do harm to perestroyka. Everything cannot be shifted onto either the central bodies alone or onto local bodies alone. But if the Politburo reports to an extended plenum of the Party's Central Committee that it will do this—call for democratization within the party—then this will be a positive example, I believe. Democratization beginning from the very top.

As far as an extraordinary party congress, I have always opposed it because I do not believe that a congress can draw up any kind of program; 5,000 people cannot carry this out. There needs to be good preparatory work. I would say that a plenum of the Party's Central Committee should be held at which the platform would be examined, discussed, and sent to primary organizations, where it would be examined, again and then, having the view of all communists of the country, then take this platform to a congress.

[Sagalayev] Yuriy Anatoliyevich, here is another question. You said that there was a moment in your political biography when you were defeated. The next elections are coming soon. What are your plans?

[Prokofyev] You know, I am not going to nominate myself; and I believe that one can be elected in only one local soviet, although legally one can and is allowed to be elected in two soviets. If the Moscow Soviet nominates me, I will run, and I will stand up for my position, and I will fight.

[Sagalayev] That is a fine answer, but now, perhaps coming to an end, I would like as a Muscovite to ask you what may seem a rather naiive question, but I think it reflects what is, so to speak, on the minds of many of the inhabitants of our city. Is Moscow going to become cleaner? What do you think?

[Prokofyev] You know, I spoke about this very matter at a news conference and at a plenum of the City Party Committee. I believe that this is simply essential. Moscow is falling into neglect. The feeling of love for it is vanishing. This is, perhaps, one of the few matters we can resolve independently, regardless of the situation in the country and without referring to the situation in the country and to economic and other difficulties. I believe

that this is precisely the area where results can be achieved most quickly and where we can show Muscovites that we can do something.

[Sagalayev] Yes. Yuriy Anatoliyevich, I would like, in concluding our conversation, to congratulate you on this appointment, to wish you great success; and I believe that this problem of cleanliness refers not only to the streets, but above all, no doubt, to human souls because the Party is concerned, should be concerned with human souls. I wish you great success in this extensive, difficult, and noble work.

[Prokofyev] Thank you very much, Eduard Mikhaylovich.

[Sagalayev] All the best.

Zaykov Interviewed on Defense Council Job

PM2611182589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview in Moscow with L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by V. Izgarshev of PRAVDA's Military Department: "At the Defense Council..."—date unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In connection with the recent Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom] decision, there have been phone calls to the editorial office over the past few days with readers asking: "What interpretation should we put on the release of Comrade Zaykov from his duties as first secretary of the capital party organization's gorkom?" That question kicked off our discussion in the CPSU Central Committee secretary's office on the fifth floor of an office block on Staraya Square.

[Zaykov] I'm a Communist and I view any party assignment as a responsible task—an order, to use military language—which must be carried out unconditionally, punctiliously, and promptly.

Incidentally, my entire life has been bound up with the defense industry and the Army.

[Izgarshev] And how far back do those ties go?

[Zaykov] Almost 50 years. A year before the war I entered a defense plant in Leningrad as a student, and I spent 36 straight years at that plant. I also had several years as general director of the "Leninets" Science and Production Association. I even studied without leaving production, as the saying goes. I studied in the evenings. I first graduated from technical college, and then from an institute. During the war the plant was evacuated to Saratov. In winter we worked out in the open and by firelight during the evenings, snatching an hour or two's sleep beside the machine tools.

[Izgarshev] Lev Nikolayevich, your current party assignment is to work on the Defense Council. Unfortunately, apart from stating that such an organ exists, our press has never mentioned it. Could you tell PRAVDA readers just what it is? What questions does it resolve?

[Zaykov] Indeed, our people have only the most general idea about the Defense Council. Yet I think everyone is well aware how quickly and dynamically the situation in the world has been changing recently. And how our state's political activeness has increased during these years. We need only recall certain major military-political initiatives in recent years. July 1985: the announcement of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. January 1986: the program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. April 1987: A whole range of proposals was put forward, including cuts in both sides' strategic offensive weapons over the next 5 years, and cuts in armed forces and arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. February 1988: The USSR decides to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. December: the program for cutting our Armed Forces by 500,000 men over the next 2 years. And this year a whole package of new proposals has been put forward on the basis of the new political thinking.

So, all the state's main military-political initiatives are now thoroughly elaborated in the Defense Council with the participation of competent experts.

I will make no secret of the fact that I've sometimes heard reproaches about excessive concessions at the arms reduction talks. But it is understandable that positive results can only be achieved if there is mutual trust and respect for the contracting parties' interests and a mutual rapprochement in positions. We approach talks in a responsible manner, weighing each step and all its possible consequences.

[Izgarshev] So whose organ is the Defense Council? Whom is it subordinate to?

[Zaykov] Under the constitution it is a state organ and its chairman is the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Its current staff also includes the head of the Soviet Government, the foreign and defense ministers, the chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, and others. I emphasize that the USSR Defense Council is an organ under the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Izgarshev] Something akin to the National Security Council [NSC] under the U.S. President?

[Zaykov] Such a comparison could probably be made. The NSC was set up in the United States after World War II as an organ to coordinate the actions of different government departments, including the State Department, the Pentagon, and the CIA. The NSC's functions include the elaboration and adoption of national security decisions, the preparation of daily reports for the President, the provision to the country's top leadership of analytical material on various aspects of military policy

as well as intelligence and the country's mobilization readiness, and the monitoring of the fulfillment of presidential decisions.

[Izgarshev] Does this mean we have borrowed anything?

[Zaykov] I don't think there's ever anything shameful about borrowing useful experience.

[Izgarshev] But we now have the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions.

[Zaykov] Are you asking about the Defense Council's relationship with that committee?

[Izgarshev] Yes, doesn't it supplant and duplicate the Defense Council's activity?

[Zaykov] No. It neither supplants it nor duplicates it. A statute on the committee has not yet been adopted. But it is clear that its functions should be of a lawmaking nature. The committee examines and makes decisions on budget spending on defense, on the maintenance of the Army and the USSR KGB, on legislative acts regulating the observance of the law in the Armed Forces, and so forth. Incidentally, such functions are carried out by corresponding Senate and House committees in the United States. The Defense Council's main task, in a nutshell, is to implement supreme organizational, executive, and control functions on specific issues of the country's defense capability and security and to coordinate the activities of competent departments.

[Izgarshev] All states have their own particularly confidential issues. For instance, strategic plans regarding the use of the Armed Forces, mobilization readiness plans, and a number of others.

[Zaykov] The USSR Defense Council handles this too. Detente is detente, but as long as there are diametrically opposed forces at work in the world we need to think about the country's defense. Yes, we profess peace and our military doctrine is defensive. We have solemnly stated that we will not be the first to attack or the first to use nuclear weapons. But this does not mean that we should relax the attention we pay to defense and to our Armed Forces' combat readiness. Other countries opposed to the socialist countries have not abandoned a single military program. New missiles, new combat aircraft, and new ships continue to be developed and to enter service there.

[Izgarshev] Haven't we been drawn once again into a destructive arms race?

[Zaykov] No, we cannot allow that to happen. In the eyes of all mankind we are now truly a country of peace. However, we cannot remain unarmed. It is well known that the strong only take notice of the strong. Reasonable defense sufficiency—that is our approach to current military building. Cutting our number of personnel, numbers of weapons, and the size of budget appropriations and guided by our defensive military doctrine, we are obliged to make tougher demands on all aspects of military activity: on technical improvements to weapons, on military science, on the level of personnel's combat and political training, on the improvement of commanders' maturity, and on the state of military discipline.

The USSR Defense Council considers it its duty to be constantly concerned about the needs of Army and Navy servicemen.

The last elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the work of the first Congress of People's Deputies and the summer and fall sessions of our parliament, and the preparations for the new soviet elections and the next, 28th, party congress are prompting a further increase in the politicization of the entire population—as our activity shows.

We must bear in mind the fact that the high demands society makes of the Armed Forces and the more critical assessment of the life and activity of units and subunits are now having an increasingly active influence on the nature of the perestroyka process in the Army and in the entire military-industrial complex.

[Izgarshev] Lev Nikolayevich, as a longstanding "defense worker," you are particularly well acquainted with the questions of conversion in the defense sectors of industry.

[Zaykov] Incidentally, the first Soviet transistor radio was built at our defense enterprise. Perhaps you remember the small "Neva" receiver of the early sixties? Its production was organized at the "Novator" Plant, where I worked. Virtually from the time that a Soviet defense industry was organized the overwhelming majority of enterprises have produced civilian output alongside weapons and military hardware.

[Izgarshev] But the task facing them now is far more difficult.

[Zaykov] Undoubtedly. Now conversion is under way—that is, the transition of capacity released from the production of weapons and military hardware to the manufacture of civilian output, particularly consumer goods. Here are a few figures. This year national economic output will account for 43 percent of defense industry output. By 1995 this figure will have reached more than 60 percent.

Defense sector enterprises produce virtually all Soviet TV sets, radios, cameras, refrigerators, and freezers, around 80 percent of electric vacuum cleaners, two-thirds of all washing machines, and almost half of all motorcycles and bicycles. The defense industry has been given a responsible new task—bringing about the retooling of the light, food, and processing industries. We have a single aim—to fully meet the demand of Soviet people and the national economy for modern goods and equipment.

[Izgarshev] These questions, as I understand it, are also discussed at the Defense Council?

[Zaykov] Of course.

[Izgarshev] Lev Nikolayevich, just what obligations rest with you personally?

[Zaykov] You see, I'm no newcomer to the Defense Council. When I was transferred from Leningrad to the Central Committee, I was instructed to deal with military-industrial sectors on the Defense Council. And when I became first secretary of Moscow Gorkom, I continued to carry out those duties. Now, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed at the Moscow Gorkom plenum, I will be focusing entirely on my work in the USSR Defense Council.

[Izgarshev] What, if it's no secret, will you begin with when you return to that office?

[Zaykov] I would rather tell you what is of particular concern to me at the moment. In connection with the cuts in appropriations for defense needs, as I see it, we have to think about how and in what way we can prevent any damage to our defense capability. This can only be done by improving the qualitative parameters of combat hardware. Obsolete arms, of course, must be removed from production. We should think about reducing the variety of weapons systems. Military personnel should be concerned about economies. For instance, how many missile test launches do we need every year? How many types of certain aircraft do we have? How many types of tank? We need to take a pencil, as the saying goes, to all these and other defense matters. Or take the following fact. Conversion is conversion, but, if necessary, we should not forget how to make defense products at our plants. We must show daily, hourly concern.

[Izgarshev] Incidentally, what is your workday like now? Is it any different from what it was at the gorkom?

[Zaykov] I'm at my desk by 0900 hours. I'm home by 2200. But even at home I have to work on papers. Often past midnight.

[Izgarshev] Does that mean you have no time for books, magazines, or going to the theater?

[Zaykov] No, to be honest. Although I keep an eye on new works of literature. I do get to the theater. Not often, but still.... [Zaykov ends]

Then, after our long and detailed talk, Vitaliy Mikhaylov, assistant to the Central Committee secretary, said to me: "He does go to the theater." "Is he invited?" I asked. Realizing the underlying theme of my question, he answered: "Yes, but he buys his own ticket."

I once heard from acquaintances in Leningrad that L.N. Zaykov, already a plant director, lived for several years with his wife and son in an eight-meter room. It was only later, when his son was grown up, that Zaykov was allocated an individual apartment.

Incidentally, this is all drawn from the man's biography and probably has nothing to do with his work. Although, as they say....

Yakovlev Links Perestroyka, Freedom of Choice

LD2611215189 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—Not only the idea and concept of perestroyka, but the very course of perestroyka has actually become a revolutionary undertaking, connected with difficulties and change in consciousness. Despite these difficulties it is making progress, said Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Appearing on Soviet television today, he noted that perestroyka at present is only creating conditions for the freedom of choice.

Yakovlev believes that a man having the freedom of choice is free to build society, economy and social structures as he wishes, is free to choose the lifepath bringing moral satisfaction.

"We have started perestroyka with the economy, realising that this is a very complicated and most neglected area," Yakovlev said. "We believed that by the time we embark on a political reform, the economy will get off the ground and start making progress. But this has not happened," he said.

"So far, absorption is easier for economic structures than rejection. The reason for this is their ossified character and the fact that they have not yet merged with the political reform, are not yet under the control of democracy. In this lies the contradiction of the present stage."

"One of the tasks of perestroyka is a clear division of powers not only between the legislative, executive and judiciary authorities, but also division between the competence of the central and local authorities. People capable of implementing these powers in a new way should fill leading posts. But the advance to power should not be made through manipulating the public opinion, through the struggle of vanity, arrogance, conceit."

Asked what is being done in perestroyka conditions for the renewal of the party Yakovlev said that this process in the party has not yet been completed.

The Congress should decide on the party's character at the given stage of the historic development, he said.

It is said now that the party is losing prestige and confidence. There are certainly many officials in the party who lost authority because of the way they worked, but it is they who lost authority, not the party. There are many examples of district and regional party committees enjoying respect, and there are people with a truly responsible attitude to their activity, Yakovlev said.

"I believe in perestroyka, in the necessity of transformations," Yakovlev said. "They are of saving character for our society. A really developed and rightly understood democracy, based on the freedom of the individual, of his awareness, and on broad morality will be the motor of our social progress," Yakovlev said.

Editor Starkov Explains Refusal To Resign

LD2611153889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 25 Nov 89

[From the "Before And After Midnight" program, interview by journalist Molchanov with Vladislav Andreyevich Starkov, chief editor of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY; date and place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Molchanov] It was proposed to remove from his job the chief editor of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY weekly, a publication that has acquired an unprecedented number of subscribers in the restructuring years, almost 32 million copies. What is more, the proposal came from the very highest spheres, but Vladislav Andreyevich Starkov, the chief editor, refused.

Vladislav Andreyevich, once upon a time you wouldn't have been asked, you'd just have been dismissed.

[Starkov] Well, yes, that's right. But the times have changed, although I wouldn't say they've changed so dramatically as regards my own fate. People's arms are still being twisted, not mine now, but those of the All-Union Znaniye [Knowledge] Society, and the question remains open.

[Molchanov] Lately, it is precisely those publications and television programs that have the indisputable leaders and gained great authority with people, for example ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, OGONEK, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, or the television programs "Pyatoye Koleso" or "600 minutes," that have begun to be subject to very harsh criticism from a part of the apparat. What is it, in your opinion, fear? A symptom? Or a normal feature of today?

[Starkov] I'm afraid it's all of them together, that fear becomes a symptom and the symptom a normal feature, because the controversial affairs that are linked with a number of publications are already turning into a kind of distinctive law. I must pick myself up on the word law, because I believe that lawlessness of this kind is possible only within the framework of the fact that we do not have a law on the press, and I hope that if it is discussed at the Supreme Soviet in the next few days that this will give us the chance to work in some way in safer conditions. On the one hand, this law talks about the responsibility of the journalists, which we accept and on the other, it talks about protection for journalists which is also vital for us.

[Molchanov] Vladislav Andreyevich, but what specifically were you accused of when it was suggested that you retire?

[Starkov] Well, we have written in detail about that in our fourth issue. Basically, it was a question of what is being called deputies' ratings. We asked our readers who, from their standpoint, had shown themselves from their best side or from their worst side at the First Congress of People's Deputies. We received 15,000 letters, analyzed those letters and published the results of the answers. Perhaps from the ethical point of view, it was improper to ask our readers about this, since, from the scientific point of view after all, it was not a complete sociological poll but only letters. But we have acknowledged this mistake and we don't feel it is so great that I should be treated in such a way—someone who has been working at ARGUMENTY I FAKTY for a long time—that I should have to leave my job.

[Molchanov] Your magazine has published an interview with Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Politburo, who said in that interview that you had admitted certain of your mistakes. What mistakes?

[Starkov] Well, that mistake. And moreover, in the next issue, we presented a second sociological poll, as it were, one done for us by scientists and in it some parameters were corrected. So, in the main it is a question of that mistake.

[Molchanov] It's not often people come to our studio with briefcases. You have. What's inside?

[Starkov] You know, this black file contains the letters of the last few days that express their support for me, as editor of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and those for the publication's line. The line is just supported. You can have a look. Take these [video shows Starkov handing over huge bundle of letters]. That the line is supported is expressed not only in the letters we are receiving but also in the subscription. After all, it is fairly hard to say that 32 million of our readers are making a mistake or (support) an inaccurate line, that we don't make for interesting reading.

[Molchanov] And all the more so when there has never been such a great number of copies published in the history of our country, for any publication.

[Starkov] That's right.

[Molchanov] Vladislav Andreyevich, no one would deny that you have civic courage. Not everyone would have taken the risk of saying no when they were right at the top. What is the source of your strength and will you have sufficient strength in the future?

[Starkov] Well, first of all, the source of my strength is in your hands at this moment [video shows Molchanov still holding the letters]. That is the living water, so to speak, with the aid of which we can keep going. The second source is my editors. The collective of editors, of like-minded people. We are supporting one another at the moment, in these difficult times for us. The third source is my family and I bring all of this together in the concept of conscience because in the end it is not in the end about

my own fate, nor even the fate of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, but about the fate of glasnost, because glasnost cannot be cut into more or less constructive concepts. Glasnost as a right is an indivisible concept. I therefore believe that a blow to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY is a blow to glasnost. Perhaps that's putting it strongly but that's how it is and people can sense this when they send us hundreds and hundreds of cables. You know, with every telegram, I always think that if a person has gone to the post office, paid money, and sent a telegram to Moscow, that means it is some sort of step by citizens, support from citizens for us. For that reason, of course, I would consider it crazy simply to ignore this support, and that is where I see the source of my strength.

[Molchanov] Thank you, Vladislav Andreyevich. I wish you strength and courage for the future.

Shevardnadze on Role of Science in Foreign Policy

LD2511043189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Solovyev video report]

[Text] The first meeting of the Scientific Council under the USSR Foreign Ministry was held today in Moscow.

[Solovyev] It is hard to imagine that our diplomacy previously functioned in isolation from science, even the political science, and indeed, that is not the case. However, the fact that until very recently no alliance existed between our diplomacy and our sciences, no alliance of cooperation, is an indisputable fact. Diplomacy did not always take the achievements of scientific thinking into account in its own activities. Leaders of different scientific schools were invited to the sitting of the council, mathematicians, political scientists, ecologists, and all of them, along with the diplomats, were agreed that the state's foreign policy activities today demand the constant saturation of diplomacy with new learning. Even if only for the following reason:

[Begin recording; video shows council meeting, with delegates seated, speakers at the rostrum, including Shevardnadze, who is seen listening attentively] [Shevardnadze] It is not a problem of diplomacy, it is a problem of our society. We have fallen well behind in our thinking. I would say by 50 years but perhaps that is a bit much, but well behind.

[Voice from the crowd] Not enough!.

[Shevardnadze] Not enough. It is no longer a question of our being lazy or incurious but of our continuing to operate outmoded scientific and technical categories. [end recording]

[Video shows Solovyev interviewing Shevardnadze] [Solovyev] Previously only one point of view held sway. How many points of view are permitted today at the Foreign Ministry with regard to just one specific problem?

[Shevardnadze] Nowadays we are unequivocally in favor of variety, the principle of variety for whatever problem, and this principle must be asserted not only in the practical activities of the Foreign Ministry but also, correspondingly, in scientific centers, at scientific research institutes, university departments, among our partners from the world of learning.

[Solovyev] Eduard Ambrosiyevich, is there a guarantee that from now on it will not be science that is keeping up with decisions that have been made, that is obeying the voice of the statesmen and following them, but the statesmen who will be listening to what science has to say and heeding its advice?

[Shevardnadze] It will be both. I would not opopose them, they are the two sides of the coin. In today's world, there can be no foreign policy, no serious foreign policy, without a scientific basis, scientific studies, scientific examination. This too is a demand of the times, the era and we too are going down the same road.

10 Wounded in Ethnic Violence in Georgia

AU2511193789 Paris AFP in English 1901 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 25 (AFP)—At least 10 people have been wounded in the last two days during armed clashes between nationalist Georgians and ethnic Ossetians in Georgia, Georgian and Ossetian sources said Saturday.

Georgian nationalist Zviad Gamsakhurdia said tension was still running high and that villages in the South Ossetia autonomous region, part of the southern republic of Georgia, were "on the brink of civil war".

Mr. Gamsakhurdia said the trouble started on Thursday [23 November] when local authorities prevented 50,000 Georgians, mostly from outside South Ossetia, from holding a demonstration in the town of Tskhinvali.

In protest the Georgians began burning tyres and setting fire to buses along main roads.

Tskhinvali and the town of Dzhava are currently sealed off by security forces, while road blocks have been set up on the roads between South Ossetia and Georgia, according to both sides.

Mr. Gamsakhurdia, contacted in the Georgian capital Tbilisi by telephone, said the Georgians wanted to "protect" the ethnic Georgians in the autonomous region.

But Zelim Tskhovrebov, a local "Popular Front" spokesman reached in Tskhinvali, said the rally had been called to incite local Georgians to take "extremist actions".

The Ossetian source charged that the Georgian security forces were "handing out weapons" to the local Georgian population, while the Georgian source charged that the incidents were KGB-mounted and "ordered from Moscow".

Amid increasingly strident demands by Georgian nationalists to break with Moscow, the Ossetians have launched their own campaign to be attached to Russia.

The region's Ossetian majority want their region to be united with North Ossetia, an autonomous republic inside the Russian Federation and the largest Soviet republic.

The anti-Russian Georgians taunted the Ossetians, calling them out into the streets and referring to them as "the children of Lenin", Mr. Tskhovrebov said.

He said that on Friday, Georgians took 60 hostages, including himself and the local police chief, in order to seek the release of a number of Georgians who had been disarmed and taken to the police station by Ossetians.

It was not known whether the prisoners and hostages had been set free.

The incidents are the latest in a series of clashes between the Ossetians and Georgians, and follow unrest in the autonomous republic of Abkhaziya, inside Georgia and on the border with Turkey.

Ethnic unrest in Armenia and Azerbaijan, neighbouring Georgia, is also continuing over the disputed territory of Nagorny Karabakh.

Leningrad Rally Demands Emergency CPSU Congress

LD2711010889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 26 November, on the "Seven Days" program hosted by Eduard Sagalayev, carries a 5-minute report on a rally in Leningrad.

Sagalayev says the large rally in Leningrad was one of the main political events in the country last week. He encourages viewers not to be taken in by their first impressions of the event. The rally was opened by Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov, the leader of the Leningrad Party organization. The video shows Gidaspov speaking into a microphone to a large crowd in the dark. He says: "Dear friends, I am not going to make any speeches. We considered it necessary today to speak openly about what we ultimately have to do. There is no person now, there is no body now that can deal with all our matters for us, and we are going to deal with them ourselves. So, let's get on with the talking."

This is followed by several unidentified male speakers who express their indignation at the party's fading authority and declining numbers, at the crisis in the country as a whole and in the party, and call for a variety of measures, including a general party discussion, direct elections from primary party organizations on an alternative basis, and for an extraordinary CPSU congress to discuss the crisis.

The video shows a variety of banners reading in part: "Supreme Soviet Communist! What color is your party card?" "The revitalized party needs a new composition of the Central Committee!" "Members of the Central Committee—What is your position?" "We are with Lenin!" "We demand the convening of an emergency CPSU Congress in January-February 1990!" "Mikhail Sergeyevich! Pay some attention to the party!!!" "The people of Vasilyevskiy Island want an emergency CPSU Congress."

'Alarm' Voiced Over 22 Nov Leningrad Rally

PM2711121189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Valeriy Vyzhutovich article under the "Event and Opinion" rubric: "Rally in Leningrad"]

[Text] A citywide party rally was held in Leningrad 22 November, and the television coverage of it could be seen by viewers in Moscow as well as in Leningrad. Let me say at once: Everything that appears below is my personal opinion, and there may be people with different perceptions and appraisals of what happened.

The rally, held after the joint plenum of the Leningrad Party Oblast Committee [obkom] and City Committee [gorkom] which adopted the Leningrad party organization's election platform in present-day conditions, was organized on the initiative of party committees from the Svetlana, Almaz, and V.I. Lenin Optical Engineering Associations, the Severnaya Verf Shipbuilding Plant, and other enterprises.

Opening the rally, B. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom and Gorkom, said: "The city, the country, and the party are in a state of crisis. And yet we are silent, sitting in our trenches and waiting for someone to come and start solving all our problems. I'm not going to deliver a speech. More than enough has been said. It is time to act. I want to hear the voice of the people. We hope that today we will hear you say what must be done and how it must be done."

And so orators started mounting the improvised rostrum:

"The Central Committee in its present composition has lost authority among the party and the people. It is incapable of heading perestroyka!"

"Who and whose interests are served by the words of People's Deputies Sobchak and Denisov to the effect that we need private ownership of the means of production? We won't allow any exploitation of man by man!"

"At long last, our obkom has defined its stance. Unfortunately, I perceive no such firm stance on the part of the Central Committee..."

"I believe that the slogan 'The Politburo Must Report on Its Actions!' should be reworded as 'The Politburo Must Answer for Its Actions!'"

"The newspapers and television have become tools of media terror... The mass media must be under workers' control!.."

Given the multitude of voices that can be heard nowadays, it was impossible not to notice the single-mindedness displayed by the orators. One after the other, they persistently erected a wall between rank-and-file Communists and the Central Committee, demanded the convening of an extraordinary party congress, vented spite and irritation against USSR Supreme Soviet deputies, spoke of cooperative members as "thieves" and "fat cats," and branded the press for its "defamatory" and "denigrating" material.

The general mood was most frankly expressed by one of the orators: "People asked after the plenum: Is the obkom's stance not the onset of a policy of tightening the screws, a firm-hand policy? No." It was persistently repeated with profound conviction: "We must do everything to rebuff those who summon us back to capitalism. Our path is the path of socialism, and we won't allow anyone to divert us from this path." If truth be told, it was not made quite clear **what sort of** socialism we ought to be pursuing. Should it be the "developed" variety with its administrative edict system which led to empty store shelves, with its apparatus diktat and the persecution of dissidents? Or should it be genuine socialism, free from flawed deformities and cleansed of Stalinist and Brezhnevite accretions? A socialism capable of feeding the people, giving scope to a healthy economy, and ensuring genuine democracy for society and individuals?

...I have only just returned from Leningrad. I spent a week there, and met leaders of workers' movements. Different people. There are some whose sentiments were reflected at the rally, there are also some "radicals." Both of them, by the way, are akin in their impatience and intolerance, in their indomitable desire to cut through, rather than untangle, the tight knots of problems which have grown tighter over the years. There are, however, also some mature and responsible people who are not inclined toward rash radicalism, who are in the mood for calm, considered, and painstaking work. So why were their speeches not heard at the city party rally?

Intolerance, bitterness... You see a banner carried above the rally participants' heads asking: "Communists in the Supreme Soviet! What Is the Color of Your Party Membership Cards?"—and you get an odd feeling, not just because you suddenly get a whiff of the era of insulting political name-calling. A Supreme Soviet session is in progress, deputies are discussing and adopting vitally important laws, at times making mistakes and going to extremes, arguing, seeking solutions. And yet it appears that those elected by the people are being suspected of harboring intentions hostile to the people. What sort of intentions? A carefully disguised desire to legislatively conduct a "restoration of capitalism"? Otherwise what is the meaning of the slogan demanding: "Political Appraisal of the Law on Ownership!" This law is not yet in existence, its nationwide discussion has only just begun, and yet—in anticipation of the debate—hints are already being dropped that the future document has a leaning "alien to our ideals."

Finally, is the ultimatum-like tone used by the rally participants in demanding accountability by the Politburo and the CPSU Central Committee appropriate and justified? Is there anyone today who doubts that these organs are accountable to the party, especially in conditions of glasnost, whose limits are constantly expanding? Is there anyone disputing the right of rank-and-file Communists to express their attitude, whatever it might be, toward the activity of the top party leadership?

Actually, this is more than just a matter of the tone of the discussion. The countless reproaches against the center clearly manifest a lack of autonomy, initiative, and original thinking. Formerly the nostalgia for leadership tutelage took the form of apathetic expectation of boons handed down from above, now it takes on a "critical" appearance, but the essence is the same: Give us, give!... Right after the rally, the television screened a report on Leningrad's soap plant: dilapidated walls, antediluvian equipment, dirt, lack of sanitary facilities, a helpless director... It is, of course, much easier to go out in the square with a banner reading "Central Committee! Where Is the Political Appraisal of the Changing Situation in the Country?" than to impose order in even a single enterprise of quite a modest size.

Observing events in the square, I thought to myself: This is also a warning to those who are, from the other flank but with equal implacability and lack of discrimination, voicing complaints against the Central Committee and frenziedly attacking the initiators of perestroyka. It is well known that extremes coincide.

"Dear friends and party comrades," B. Gidaspov said at the end of the rally, "thank you for coming here and supporting us. We thank with all our hearts all who are with us, all who are for socialism."

And the brass band struck up: "Hostile winds are blowing around us..."

I understand everything: Life is hard when the store shelves are empty and money is devalued. The country is experiencing a crisis. In these difficult and increasingly complex conditions, it is not easy to keep spirits on an even keel, to suppress irritation, and to refrain from going to extremes in words and deeds. I understand everything, except this: Who and why finds it necessary right now, at a time when patience, endurance, and calm are needed perhaps more than ever before, to erect ideological barriers between his fellow citizens, to opt for clamor instead of normal human speech, and to seek enemies in our own fatherland as was done in the past, with bitterness and suspicion?..

B. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom and Gorkom, gave a press conference at the Smolnyy Institute 24 November devoted to the results of the joint plenum of the party obkom and gorkom and to

the citywide rally of Communists. Among the other questions addressed to the leader of Leningrad City and Oblast, IZVESTIYA's own correspondent V. Nevelskiy asked:

"Boris Veniaminovich, it is perfectly obvious that the ideas and slogans predominant at the rally are a repetition and development of the ideas outlined in Nina Andreyeva's famous article which was dubbed the 'manifesto of anti-perestroyka forces...' In essence, the entire rally was a call to revert to yesterday's socialism. By taking part in it you, as first secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom and Gorkom, seemed to express solidarity with this position. Is this right or not?"

"I totally disagree with you. I see nothing in common between the positions of the joint plenum of the Leningrad party obkom and gorkom and Nina Andreyeva's position. They have nothing in common. You say that the slogans are identical. Maybe these slogans display our inherent Slav desire to feel disappointed by our leaders... Incidentally, very many of the anti-perestroyka slogans—especially those of the Andreyeva ilk—were not brought by Communists... The slogans which were brought by Communists were not dictated by anyone. I don't even know who wrote them, I don't know when or where they originated. These slogans prove just one point: Everyone is tired of words. The spoken word is losing its power. Everyone wants specific deeds. How can it be bad if we say that it is necessary to strengthen party discipline? How can it be bad if we say that it is possible to boost production and technology discipline? How can this be a step backwards? It is no such step... Therefore I firmly dissociate myself from all attempts to link the actions of the Leningrad party obkom and gorkom with a desire to revert to the policy of war communism."

Well, we did not set ourselves the task of analyzing the plenum decisions. The topic of these remarks is different—alarm and anxiety at what was seen and heard at the 22 November party rally in Leningrad.

Ukrainian Catholics Stage Demonstration 26 Nov

AU2711124789 Paris AFP in English 0900 GMT 27 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 27 (AFP)—More than 100,000 Ukrainian Catholics demonstrated Sunday for the legalisation of their Church, four days before President Mikhail Gorbachev flies to Rome for a first meeting with the Pope.

Between 100,000 and 150,000 people attended an open air religious service in the centre of Lvov, according to Anatoliy Dotsenko, a member of the Ukrainian Popular Front mass movement for reform.

He said Ivan Gell, chairman of the Ukrainian Catholic or Uniate Church defence committee addressed the crowd, appealing to Mr. Gorbachev to legalise the Uniate Church, which Stalin forcibly merged with the Orthodox Church in 1946.

Mr. Dotsenko said the demonstrators paraded through Lvov after the religious service was over. No incidents were reported. An estimted 20,000 people held a similar rally on Sunday in the western Ukrainian town of Ivano-Frankovsk.

He said the demonstrations were neither "authorised nor banned" by the authorities.

Mr. Gorbachev flies to Rome on Wednesday [29 November] and is to meet Pope John Paul II on Friday. The issue of the Uniate Church is expected to be high on the agenda of this first Vatican-Soviet summit.

Official Says No Government Repression of Miners

LD2411174789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1633 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 24 November (TASS)—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov reports: An allegation by Sergey Grigoryants, editor-in-chief of the Moscow-based 'GLASNOST' journal, to the effect that a Ministry of Internal Affairs commission is carrying out repressive measures against the participants in the strikes in Vorkuta has been described categorically in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs as an absolute fabrication.

In an interview with the Voice of America on 18 November, S. Grigoryants, who is in Washington, asserted, in particular, that "...A special commission of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is operating in Vorkuta, collecting compromising material about the miners, the miners are being tried, they are being fined, they are fining people who have not worked for a long time and who have no money. Generally, the situation is getting worse and worse..."

In this connection, the press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR reported that in Vorkuta no plans were made to try in court, and, of course, no court case was conducted against miners for taking part in the strike. Neither has any miner been fined for this by court or internal affairs bodies. As to the work of a special commission of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, which is allegedly collecting compromising material on the miners, no such commission has existed or does exist either in Vorkuta or in any other place, where the strikes took place. For tasks of this kind are not in the competence of the Internal Affairs Ministry bodies. In Vorkuta indeed a group of staff of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry are at work checking citizens' applications regarding the shortcomings in the selection and distribution of local militia personnel. This is the only thing it does. It was stressed that Grigoryants' allegations have no real grounds and are complete inventions of the editor-in-chief of the 'GLASNOST' magazine. At present, the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry reported, the situation in the city of Vorkuta is coming back to normal.

Komi Aide Denies Vorkuta Miners Being Prosecuted

PM2411201989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Own correspondent Viktor Filipov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Conjecture and Facts"]

[Text] Vorkuta—As of 22 November only one of the "Vorkutaugol" Association's 13 pits—the "Vorgashorskaya"—was still on strike. I failed to carry out the editorial office's instructions of recording for readers the dialogue between the leaders of the party committee and the strike committee at the pit. A. Kiforenko, party secretary at "Vorgashorskaya," willingly agreed to a discussion. But S. Kozlov, deputy chairman of the strike committee (chairman I. Guridov is in Moscow), refused point-blank to deal with your correspondent.

[Kozlov] I do not want to talk to you.

[Filippov] Do you have any complaints about me?

[Kozlov] No complaints, but I do not want to talk. [Kozlov ends]

I had another conversation—again brief, but more emotional—with I. Rybalchenko, a member of the Russian People's Front and a worker at the "Vorgashorskaya" Pit. Straightaway he lambasted journalists who, in his opinion, are doing nothing but "defiling the working class" in Vorkuta. There was no point arguing. I did not want to hear I. Rybalchenko's other arguments...

An hour earlier I had heard his speech at the latest meeting of workers at the pit. The strike committee holds such meetings four times a day—before each shift. Many people at "Vorgashorskaya" are working—the mine has to be kept in normal working order. Only the coal mining has stopped. At the meeting I. Rybalchenko reported that prosecutions have started against the strikers: He claimed that criminal proceedings had already been instituted against three members of the city workers (strike) committee.

Immediately after the meeting I contacted the city militia department. V. Simonov, Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic deputy internal affairs minister, who is currently in command in Vorkuta, answered. And it transpired that no criminal proceedings have been instituted against the members of the city workers (strike) committee who organized the unsanctioned procession through the town 17 November. A talk had merely been held with them about the impermissibility of violating the USSR Supreme Soviet decree pertaining to the procedure for holding meetings, rallies, and street processions.

Back on 21 November the "Vorgashorskaya" received a government telegram stating that, as an exception, the pit management had been permitted not to reduce annual leave by the number of days spent out on strike—which, following the court ruling, had been equated with absenteeism. One of the main problems of concern to miners over the past few days was thus removed. If they are now suffering because of the strike, it will only be economically: It will clearly be necessary to pay fines to railroad workers and coal consumers.

But do the miners know the truth? The strike committee representatives have not said a word about the removal of sanctions against the miners. Nobody apart from them has spoken at rallies for the past 3 days.

The workers movement in Vorkuta is full of all kinds of conjecture. I have already reported the "canard" about the alleged freezing of the Vorkuta Strike Committee's bank account (IZVESTIYA No 326). And here is the result: A telegram has arrived from the delegates to the conference of the Union of Kuzbass Working People promising to hold a warning strike to protest the persecution of the Vorkuta miners. And on 23 November a representative of the Inta Strike Committee arrived at "Vorgashorskaya" bringing the encouraging news that miners at the "Intaugol" Association are also prepared to stage solidarity strikes.

Conjecture is flourishing, but there is nobody to scotch it in good time. The miners do not want to listen to the city party committee officials. And hardly anyone has been setting foot in "Vorgashorskaya" during this worrying period.

Kemerovo Obkom Holds Plenum 24 Nov

LD2411154789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] An obkom plenum was held in Kemerovo today. Its participants discussed a program of action of the oblast party organization for the earliest period. About 18,000 remarks and proposals have been made to the draft which was published earlier. It is, of course, not by chance that the people of the Kuzbass are adopting such active positions. The present time has been filled with stormy political events, and although in recent months a general strike in the oblast has been avoided, the necessary stabilization of the political situation has not come about. Discipline is falling at enterprises, treaty commitments are being violated; in a word, the restructuring of the economy is proceeding slowly. The main reasons are a sluggishness in the transferring of pits and open-cast mines to economic and juridical independence and the extremely slow development of the social sphere.

In these conditions, the work of the party itself is in need of decisive regeneration, the participants in the plenum noted. Even today, it is necessary to start preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and to do everything to convince people of the correctness of the concept of perestroyka.

Interregional Deputies Discuss Upcoming Congress

LD2611145789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Nov (TASS)—A meeting of the coordinating council of the Interregional Deputies' Group, which was held today in one of the auditoriums of the capital's university, was devoted to a discussion of the agenda for the coming Congress of People's Deputies.

Opening the meeting Boris Yeltsin, cochairman of the Interregional Deputies' Group, announced that its leadership is proposing that a broad debate be launched in respect of certain provisions in the USSR Constitution, presenting for separate discussion Article 6 of the basic law, which, as is common knowledge, enshrines in a legislative way the leading role of the CPSU. He also proposed that the deputies belonging to the group take an active part in the discussion of the Bills on Ownership, Land, and Land Use. In Boris Yeltsin's opinion the members of the group should come forward with an initiative that the question of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh be considered at a closed session of the congress.

During a discussion of these proposals that ensued, certain members of the group pointed out that a debate on Article 6 of the Constitution could distract the Congress of People's Deputies from examining much more important problems—the model of relations between the union republics and new laws on ownership, the land and state enterprises. A number of members of the group were fairly pessimistic about the chances of removing Article 6 from the basic law, for which the support of two-thirds of the Congress would be needed. Nevertheless, at today's session of the group the majority voted in favor of raising the matter at the Congress.

The members of the group also decided to seek to include on the agenda for the Congress a discussion of the activity of the Supreme Soviet. In particular, they intend to demand that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, should deliver an appropriate report. In the view of the Interregional Deputies' Group, the Congress agenda should also include an account of the work of the parliamentary commission on privileges.

The decisions taken today are preliminary ones. They are to be confirmed at a session of all members of the Interregional Deputies' Group which is to be held in Moscow on 9-10 December.

RSFSR Sets Up Committee for National Questions

PM2411125189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has formed the RSFSR Republic State Committee for National Questions.

Interregional Development Front Set Up

LD0111211589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0806 GMT 1 Nov 89

[Summary] "An interregional front for the development of the native peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East has been set up." Representatives of practically all the peoples of the area met in Syktyvkar. It was decided to set up a charitable development fund to protect their culture and way of life: it aims to attract wide masses of people to this course.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet To Meet 26 Dec

NC2511065089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to call the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet in Baku on 26 December.

Armenian Parliament Session Postponed to 4 Dec

NC2511073489 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian republic: In the coming days vital issues concerning the country and the republic will be discussed during the USSR Supreme Soviet session which will require the presence of the USSR people's deputies from the Armenian republic and a group of deputies from the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian republic in Moscow. In view of this fact, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian republic has found it advisable to convene the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian republic session on 4 December instead of 30 November as originally scheduled.

NKAO Council Welcomes U.S. Senate Resolution

NC2611115889 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] The newspaper KHORHRDAYIN KARABAKH has published the statement issued by the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] National Council Presidium in connection with the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs' protest sharply criticizing the draft resolution on the NKAO problem endorsed by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The ministry's protest says that the resolution has understandably aroused a sharp reaction from Soviet citizens.

It is not clear to us who has empowered Bessmertnykh, first deputy foreign minister, to express indignation in the name of all Soviet citizens. However, we could testify that the entire Armenian people and the population of

NKAO are greatly satisfied with the Senate decision. Moreover, the NKAO population, embodied in the National Council, on many occassions has appealed for moral and political support from the democratic states, including the U.S.

Therefore, the Armenian people in no way regard the Senate decision as a gross and uncalled-for interference. We regard this resolution as an expression of the good will from the American people—a people trying to contribute to the solution of the NKAO problem, the essence of which is national self-determination.

The statement of the presidium of the National Council of Artsakh [NKAO] asked: One wonders how the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs finds it possible to issue statements and decisions in the name of the Soviet people in connection with developments in various parts of the globe without understanding that those statements are an interference in the internal affairs of the other states.

Armenian Group Condemns USSR Reaction

NC2411221489 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] The papers have reported the draft resolution endorsed by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the statement made in this connection by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The full text of the resolution has been published.

The Administrative Committee of the Armenian National Movement has issued a declaration asserting that the resolution confirms the fact that the issue of self-determination of the Armenian population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is fully within the jurisdiction of international law. Therefore, the problem concerns all the states which have assumed international responsibilities. Contemporary politics cannot ignore the blatant violation of the right of a nation to self-determination, in particular as this is accompanied by an unbroken chain of brutal persecution of the Armenian people. The Sumgait genocide, the bloody incidents in Baku and Kirovabad, the forced uprooting of the Armenian population, the blockade of the NKAO and Armenia, and the terroristic acts committed by the Soviet Army against the Armenian people go beyond the framework of the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and become a matter of concern for the entire civilized world.

As regards the USSR Foreign Ministry's official protest against the aforesaid resolution, it simply confirms yet another obvious fact that the Soviet Union is still far from being a law-governed state and is not yet ready to respect the international responsibilities it has itself assumed. To say the least, such a reaction is bizarre for a country which boasts of being the protector of the self-determination of the peoples of Namibia, Nicaragua, Palestine, and other countries. The ministry's protest says that the representatives of the Azeri and Armenian peoples and the republican and central authorities are exerting efforts to resolve the tense situation in the NKAO. It is obvious, however, that the Azerbaijani and central authorities are applying only a policy of oppression: the full economic blockade of the oblast is continuing, accompanied by instigatory acts on the part of the Azeris. Thus, the protest of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs is merely the logical continuation of the policy of force applied by the central authorities against the Armenian people. If the U.S. Senate resolution is regarded by them as an interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, then that very protest in itself is a blatant violation of the sovereign rights of the Armenian republic and of the right to self-determination of the NKAO. This is because not only does it not reflect the will of the Armenian people, it also fully contradicts its national interests.

U.S. Resolution Defended

NC2511085689 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Excerpts] The workers of the republic continue to express indignation at the statement issued by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the U.S. Senate resolution on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. [passage omitted]

Mamikon Kharazyants has entitled his report: A Universal Wave of Dissatisfaction.

[Begin recording] [Kharazyants] Of course, many predicted the cause of this dissatisfaction. The topic of conversation at home, in the work place, on the streets, and almost everywhere else virtually centers on the U.S. Senate resolution on the NKAO problem and the infamous protest of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The people's rage is justified. For months the entire Armenian population has tensely waited for a final solution to the NKAO problem, yet no progress has been made. The students and faculty at Yerevan State University are also indignant. They too are raising a strong protest against the indifference shown toward our people. The time has come when it is no longer possible to remain silent, said Babken Arutyunyan, lecturer of Armenian history and science director at the Armenian historical geography and cartography laboratory.

[Arutyunyan] When we read the 20 November edition of PRAVDA, we were surprised to learn that all Soviet people, including the Armenian people, have protested the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee resolution on the NKAO problem. We later learned that the resolution was ratified by the U.S. Senate. Strangely enough, history is repeating itself. In 1921 a treaty was signed between Soviet Russia and Turkey without Armenia's participation and then was presented to the Armenian people as a friendship act. In 1953 the Soviet Government relinquished its demand [from Turkey during

World War II] for Armenian territories without negotiating with the Armenian people and Armenian government. Today, the Soviet Government and Foreign Ministry expresses its protest in the name of the entire people. When were the Soviet people ever informed and when did they ever express their reaction so that the Foreign Ministry now assumes responsibility to express its protest in the name of the entire people. This is an infamous act and incident.

Obviously, the inalienable right of one of the Soviet peoples is being trampled upon. Besides, there is no question of interfering in the internal affairs of a country. We remember many occasions when the Soviet Government made its views known to this or that country on this or that matter and these were never regarded as interference in another's internal affairs. The Soviet Government has always defended national liberation struggles and has provided armed and political assistance. These have never been regarded as interference in other's affairs. Yet today, when the U.S. Senate has simply expressed its desire in an innocent manner that this problem be solved justly, it is suddenly seen as interference in internal affairs. [passage omitted]

I think that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Armenian Supreme Soviet must resolutely protest this Foreign Ministry statement; steps must be taken to prevent the recurrence of such actions, because such things do not help to strengthen our federation. Rather, they give rise to distrust and emotions between the people and disagreement between the members of the federation. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Gorbachev Response on NKAO Question Criticized

NC2211181089 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] The all-union students conference was held in Moscow. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU and chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, delivered a speech.

Many questions put to the Soviet leader by the representatives of the students were about social renovation, progress of restructuring, democracy, and openness. Mikhail Gorbachev was also asked if he accepts the principle of national self-determination in the form defined in international acts. If so, why does he oppose this principle in the case of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and in certain other cases?

The Soviet leader, describing the concerns of the Artsakh [NKAO] population about the development of their authonomy as [word indistinct], said that the issue concerns the satisfaction of economic, social, and cultural needs; and the legal rights of the people of the NKAO must be respected. It is neccessary that the oblast have real autonomy; all the possibilities of development of that people must be ensured.

There can be no victors. It is obvious that the proble must be solved by respecting both Azerbaijan and Armenia. We must solve the problem as our common pain and concern. I see no solution in the method of cut and cast aside. I think such a thing will in principle be incompatible with the restructuring effort. We will certainly solve that problem together.

It might not be solved in one stroke, because too many wounds have accumulated and these have engendered many [word indistinct]. This teaches us to be careful about them. Members of any nationality must feel at home anywhere in our country and must be sure of their present and future. Could we ever assume the path of oppression of [words indistinct] people? Such a thing will destroy our restructuring. Most important, it will not consolidate and reform our union and the world, stressed the Soviet leader.

However, in describing the complexity of the NKAO problem, Mikhail Gorbachev neither referred directly to international principles on national self-determination—as requested by the question—nor to Leninist concepts of self-determination.

Armenians Warn Gorbachev of Regional Tension

NC2611094889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1300 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Special ARMENPRES correspondents report that on 24 November, during the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Armenian and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] deputies submitted a (?joint) statement to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in which they expressed extreme concern over the exacerbation of the tension in the region, the escalation of the blockade of the NKAO, and the continuation of threats to reimpose a blockade on Armenia. The USSR people's deputies have enumerated the dramatic (?chronology) of the recent days which reflects (?extreme) [word indistinct] and (?barbaric nature). The statement says: We consider it our duty to emphasize that [passage indistinct] as a (?means) for the solution of the NKAO problem. It is not possible to remove it from the agenda by illegal methods. The USSR people's deputies indicate that the sluggishness and irresolution exhibited by the highest authorities during the discussion of this problem only reinforces the reactionary forces in the belief of their immunity. On behalf of their constituencies in Armenia and the NKAO, the USSR People's Deputies have called on the USSR Supreme Soviet to take effective measures to ensure the security of the Armenians living in Azerbaijan and to speed up the political solution of the NKAO problem by considering the interests of all the (?civilized) sides in order to thwart future [word indistinct] oppression in the region.

Uzbek Delegate Explains Student Forum Walkout

PM1711152789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Who Left the Hall"]

[Text] Yesterday, at 1932 hours, half an hour before the close of the plenary session at the All-Union Student Forum, the entire Uzbek delegation left the hall.

"We came to Moscow to discuss questions of student life and make specific decisions," explained Andrey Karimov, a student at Tashkent University and cochairman of the republic student forum. "But the discussion of procedural niceties here developed into an unsanctioned rally. From the outset the standing orders, which had been established by the delegates themselves, were ignored, people came up to the microphone just to establish their presence. One delegate spent almost 10 minutes explaining why Stanislav Smirnov, secretary of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League (cochairman of the forum preparatory committee), was chairing the session, although voting on that had already taken place. Is that how problems are solved?

"Representatives of our delegation spoke three times. The last time we gave quite official notice that if the hall did not return to specific problems, our delegation would quit the hall. We waited 10 minutes... And our action—it is a normal part of political culture. After all, we were not setting ultimatums, we wanted to work normally. And, incidentally, we did everything that was required of us: We submitted our proposals and voted. We will now work in discussion centers."

New Uzbek Deputy Premier Appointed

LD2111000589 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 7 Nov 89 p 1

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees the appointment of Comrade Uktam Kuchkarovich Ismailov as deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers, having released him from his duties as minister of local industry for the Uzbek SSR. [passage omitted]

Uzbek Party Plenum Announces Personnel Changes

LD2511125389 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 0215 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Excerpts] The 18th plenum of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee was held yesterday. [passage omitted]

Kadyrov was relieved of his duty as member of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau in connection with his being confirmed as deputy chairman of the USSR Ministry of Electrotechnical Industry and Equipment Building.

Mamarasulov, first secretary of the Taskent Oblast party committee was elected member of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Changes were made in the composition of the Ideological Commission as well as the Central Committee Commission for Socioeconomic Development. [name indistinct], secretary of the Uzbekistan Central Committee Communist Party was confirmed as chairman of the Ideological Commission. [passage omitted]

Uzbek Supreme Soviet Concludes Session

LD2511150689 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek 1300 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Excerpts] The 12th session of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened in Tashkent on 25 November. [passage omitted]

In connection with organizational question, Deputy Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee took the floor. He proposed to relieve Romanovskiy of his duty as deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet presidium in connection with his appointment to a new job in the USSR Supreme Soviet and pointed out that the Council of Elders recommended Deputy Bugrov, who hitherto has been working as minister of consumer services to the population of the Uzbek SSR. The relevant decision was adopted on this question.

Later, the last question, the question of confirmation of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet decrees, was examined. Deputy Bekulbekova, secretary of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium took the floor on this question. The relevant decision was also adopted on this question.

With this, the 12th session of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation concluded its work.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Adopts Laws

LD2411112589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Moldavian Supreme Soviet session, which continued today, adopted laws on changes and additions to the republic's constitution, and on the election of people's deputies to the Supreme Soviet and local soviets. [video caption names correspondent as Ivan Petkov; shows session proceedings]

[Petkov] The session has been tense but constructive. Here is one of the many moments when certain USSR people's deputies and representatives of public movements that have been invited here are attempting to persuade the deputies to adopt a number of amendments to the articles of laws, whose essence is at variance with the norms of the existing USSR Constitution.

The new law on elections laid down that every citizen in Moldavia enjoys electoral rights without any qualification in respect of residence, origin, social and property status, race or nationality, religion, mother tongue, or nature of work. The elections themselves will be held only for single-seat electoral constituencies. The number of candidates for election as deputies to the Supreme Soviet and the local soviets is not limited.

The word "sovereignty" has been heard more frequently than previously at this session. It is being expressed emotionally by those who, behind their loud declarations, do not see general problems affecting the country and who are attempting to tackle them within national borders. It is probably against this background that the judgements of deputies, well-known directors of large-scale concerns in the republic and economists, are being received. [video shows interview with M.G. Dumbravan, deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet and USSR people's deputy. name and post on screen caption]

[Begin Dumbravan recording] The republic's sovereignty is closely linked with the economic base of the republic. The financial autonomy of the republic is, in this respect, coming to the fore. Inasmuch as our republic has very large-scale close links with many areas of the country and many union republics, it is necessary to work on this concept of mutual links with other republics and regions of the country. Otherwise it will turn out that we do not have real financial autonomy. It will not be the real thing, and it will be unfounded to refer to the sovereignty of the republic. [end recording]

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Addresses Ethnic Issues

LD2411150189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Video report by correspondent Z. Kurkletite from the 23 November Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet session in Vilnius—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kurkletite] A wide range of questions is being discussed at the session. The first is the fixing of elections of people's deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], which are planned for 24 February 1990. On the session agenda there is also the draft law of the Lithuanian SSR on the rights of trade unions in Lithuania, the draft law of the Lithuanian SSR on the procedure for paying pensions to working pensioners, and other issues. But perhaps the most important question of today's session is the law of the Lithuanian SSR on ethnic minorities. The speaker, (Justinus Matsinkyavichus), member of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and people's poet of Lithuania, gave a profound analysis of interethnic relations in Lithuania.

[Begin recording] [Kurkletite] Attached to the Council of Ministers, a Committee of Nationalities has been created to resolve economic, social, and cultural issues and the needs of ethnic minorities. What are these needs?

[G.S. Kobetskayte, Nationalities Committee chairwoman, identified by screen caption] In effect, the first step is to bring the problem of national minorities from the ideological sphere, into the state sphere, and into the sphere of resolving certain problems. I think that the problem of creating ethnic schools, of which there are not enough and of which there were not enough in the past, will be one of the main problems of the committee...also the problem of culture, linked both to the organization of certain amateur collectives, possibly theaters, also to the press being published in national languages. As far as civilian rights are concerned, in my opinion, all citizens of the republic must be equal. Their rights cannot be decided on the basis of national differences. [end recording]

[Kurkeltite] The law was passed by a majority of votes. The republic guarantees all citizens of the Lithuanian SSR, regardless of nationality, equal political, economic, and social rights and freedoms, recognizes the national identity and continuity of culture, and encourages the manifestation of ethnic self-consciousness and self-expression.

Minorities Law Adopted

LD2511222289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet continued its work today. A draft law on the payment of pensions to pensioners who continue to work was considered. A deputies' commission has been formed and tasked with finishing the work on the draft law. Adoption of the draft law on the rights of trade unions of the Lithuanian SSR has been postponed. The session adopted the law of the Lithuanian SSR on national minorities. According to it, all citizens of the republic, irrespective of their nationality, are guaranteed equal political, economic, and social rights and freedoms. Individual deputies posed the question of suspension or change by the republic's Supreme Soviet of Article 6 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution. The relevant commission was instructed to prepare and submit its proposals on this question. It was decided to continue the work of the session on 4 December.

Lithuanians Seek Referendum on Soldiers' Vote

LD2411131189 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Summary] Signatures are being collected here in Lithuania for the demand to the republican Supreme Soviet to hold a referendum during whch the citizens of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] should decide if soldiers of the Soviet military forces deployed on the territory of the republic who arrived here to do their military service from other republics, should be given the right to take part in elections to the administrative bodies of this republic.

As is known, not long ago a law on elections was passed by the Supreme Soviet which granted the right to all soldiers of the Soviet Armed Forces serving on the territory of the republic to participate in the elections to the republican Supreme Soviet.

Supported by Sajudis and other political organizations, the initiative to demand a referendum was taken by the Lithuanian Democrats' Party. Of course, the Yedinstvo Organization and the Committee for Defense of Soclaism are against the idea.

S. Peciliunas, a representative of the Lithuanian Democrat Party, said that the republican Supreme Soviet must decide either to go for a referendum, which is very expensive in terms of money and most likely will get what it is aiming at, or to resolve the issue at the next session of the Supreme Soviet.

Estonia Streamlines Government Structure

PM2311154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent L. Levitskiy's report under the rubric "In the Republics' Governments": "Change in Structure of Estonian Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The Estonian Council of Ministers has examined the draft law "On the Government of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]." The document was ratified after sharp disputes at several sessions.

"This decision was dictated by life. There is a need for a new government structure according with the concept of an economically independent sovereign Estonia," I. Toome, chairman of the Council of Ministers, said when presenting the draft law to Supreme Soviet deputies. "We have proceeded from the fact that the present government is cumbersome, difficult to manage, and contains superfluous elements. The structure of the Council of Ministers contains too many tiers—Presidium of the Council of Ministers, deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers.... In such a system, ministers are not like ministers any more. They are led, they are watched over, and therefore all responsibility is taken away from them."

You will not often hear such a harsh assessment of a government. What is being proposed? To halve the number of ministries, committees, and ministers. According to the draft, the members of the new government are called ministers and the chairman is the prime minister. He has no deputies. In all, 17 ministries are envisaged, although there will be slightly more ministers—21.

Rights and duties are also changing, the ministries' responsibility is increasing. The republic's State Planning Committee is being transformed into the Ministry of the Economy.

Questions regarding the budget, state loans, taxation, and customs and excise, and the organization of the monetary system will be dealt with by the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry of Internal Affairs is being transferred to the republic's jurisdiction. New functions are being added to the previous task of protecting law and order—ensuring internal security and the inviolability of the state border and regulating travel abroad and foreigners' visits to Estonia. The ministry is also responsible for fire safety, for organizing civil defense, and for ensuring freedom of the press and the safekeeping of state secrets. The KGB will retain its status for the present in the new year.

The Estonian State Committee for Material and Technical Supply is being reorganized into the Ministry of Union Relations. Its task will be to carry out wholesale trade with union republics, conclude contracts, determine quotas for the sale of output and issue licenses for it. There will be a special licensing department. All the paperwork of the republic government and the prime minister will be put in the hands of a state chancellery. It will be headed by a minister of state.

"The most important aim of the new government is the creation of conditions for the rapid development of a socially and economically strong sovereign republic, the protection of the natural environment and thrifty use of natural resources, and economic cooperation with other union republics and foreign states," I. Toome stressed, speaking at the 13th session of the Supreme Soviet.

The draft law "On the Estonian SSR Government" will be published in the press. After public discussion, the Supreme Soviet will examine the new law.

Estonian Komsomol Congress Opens 24 Nov

LD2411130689 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Tallinn, Estonia, November 24 TASS-ETA—The Young Communist League of Soviet Estonia opened its 21st Congress here today to discuss its renewal.

The congress is being attended by Estonian Communist Party and government leaders.

Representatives of republican scientific institutions, public movements and organisations, the army and the Evangelical Lutheran Church are attending it as consulting experts.

Comparison of Slyunkov Economic Conference Speech

PM1611164589

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 November 1989 carries in its Second Edition on page 3 an "abbreviated" account of the closing speech delivered by N.N. Slyunkov at the 13-15 November All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on Problems of Radical Economic Reform. Comparison of the PRAVDA Second Edition item, also entitled "Strategy and Tactics of Economic Reform," with the translation of the Moscow PRAVDA Russian First Edition version, which was published on pages 51-55 of the 16 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, reveals the following variations:

Page 51, column two, the Second Edition version omits all of paragraph six, from: "If we resolve..." through "...will be guaranteed" on page 52.

Page 52, column one, second full paragraph, second sentence in Second Edition version reads: "...requirements are satisfied. Socioeconomic development in the country as a whole is unsteady. That is why..." (adding sentence);

Page 52, column two, sixth full paragraph, Second Edition version omits passage from second paragraph, fourth sentence, from: "Some steps were..." through end of fourth paragraph to "..with great responsibility."

Page 53, column one, Second Edition version omits passage from beginning of second full paragraph: "Above all we..." through the end of third sentence of third full paragraph to "...economy and resource-saving."

Paragraph four, the Second Edition version omits last three sentences from: "The economy persists..." to "...are falling slowly."

Paragraph six, the Second Edition version omits the last sentence from: "Along with the..." through "...and management organs."

Paragraph seven, the Second Edition version omits the last sentence from: "This will make..." through "...and technical tasks."

Page 53, column two, the Second Edition version omits the last two sentences of paragraph one from: "In this connection..." through "...on competitive principles."

Paragraph four in the Second Edition version omits the last sentence from: "That is why..." through "...tested in practice."

Page 54, column one, paragraph four, last sentence of the Second Edition reads: "...strengthen the ruble.

"In 1988-1989 monetary incomes will exceed the sales of goods and paid services by approximately R40 billion. And this process is gathering momentum. This year R17 billion may be printed, or R5.2 billion more than last year.

"The main cause..." (adding paragraph, picking up fifth paragraph);

Fifth paragraph, last sentence, the Second Edition reads: "...enterprises and cooperatives.

"The increase in wages funds is, as a rule, not based on actual increases in labor productivity, lower expenditure and prime costs, or enhanced production efficiency but on unjustified price increases and changes in the range of goods with the quality and quantity of goods remaining virtually unchanged.

"It is not easy..." (adding paragraph, picking up seventh paragraph);

Paragraph seven, Second Edition version omits last two sentences from: "The conference participants'..." through "...each of them."

Page 54, column two, first paragraph, penultimate sentence, the Second Edition version reads: "...increased by R38 billion. Material resources totaling approximately R25 billion are tied up and R10 billion have been paid out in wages without a corresponding return.

"The USSR Council..." (supplying alternative version of last two sentences of first paragraph, picking up second paragraph).

Economic

Conversion of Defense Sector Discussed

LD0411232789 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 4 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 4 TASS—The conversion of the Soviet defence sector stimulates the development of the country's exports and helps improve its structure, Nikolay Mikhailov, general director of the defence scientific production amalgamation "Vympel", told a briefing in the Soviet Foreign Ministry press centre today.

Defence sector can offer the world market a wide range of high tech products and services, Mikhilov stressed. The information science and communications are particularly competitive fields, in which Soviet scientists have made original technical innovations and filled the gap between the Soviet and Western science.

The contribution of Soviet defence plants to the export potential could have been greater, if it were not for a number of inveterate problems, including the secret nature of the defence sector.

The regulations governing the secrecy of defence plants and scientific research are now being reconsidered to give more freedom to defence plants and to make their contribution to the economy more weighty.

A bill on conversion has been elaborated and will soon be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet for consideration.

A number of high-tech areas call for joint efforts with foreign partners, including the creation of a system of global ecological monitoring and the development of a global calamity warning equipment.

No country can solve these problems on its own. Cooperation with foreign countries in production of high-tech medical equipment and in bio-technology is promising.

To reveal the export potentials of the defence sector new forms of business cooperation with foreign partners, including joint stock societies and joint production, are needed, Mikhailov believes.

Shortage of Newsprint Causes Alarm

Deputy Minister Interviewed

90US0157A Moscow TRUD in Russian 28 Oct 89 p 1

[Report on interview with USSR Deputy Minister of the Timber Industry V.A. Chuyko by A. Rostarchuk: "Newsprint Shortage Continues"; date and place not specified]

[Text] **For several days now, TRUD has not been printed in Chernigov due to the newsprint shortage. The newspaper has to be transported from Kiev in order not to leave the subscribers without it. However, this cannot go on for a long time.... Disruptions occur in other cities of our country as well. For many days, TRUD has been printed on borrowed newsprint in Vladivostok, Voronezh, Voroshilograd, Simferopol, Zaporozhye, Odessa.... After all, the patience and, most importantly, newsprint stocks of creditors, may come to an end in these cities as well. What has prevented the suppliers of newsprint from meeting their obligations to the daily with the greatest circulation in our country this time around? Our correspondent has tried to learn this from USSR Deputy Minister of the Timber Industry V. Chuyko.**

[Rostarchuk] Vladimir Alekseyevich, the TRUD publishers believe the exact compliance with our foreign trade obligations by your ministry to be the main cause of the current newsprint crisis. In other words, the pulp-and-paper combines are now busy delivering for exports and domestic consumers have to wait. Is this indeed so?

[Chuyko] Indeed, this aspect may also be considered to be one of the main causes of what you have called a crisis. However, the ministry has already taken some measures so that Soviet partners would not suffer due to our contracts with foreign companies. As a result of these measures, the situation should change rapidly in the very immediate future. To be sure, there are other explanations for the situation which has emerged....

[Rostarchuk] For example, the absence of cars, unavailability of raw materials at the combines, increasing press runs of periodicals, and so on, and so forth. However, this year alone TRUD has reported this many times but this has not done us any good. Disruptions with newsprint continue. If you are going to recite all of this now bolstering every thesis by "sure-fire" statistics, I am afraid that our readers will get the impression that the ministry still has not developed a realistic program for increasing the production of newsprint. These are mere words. Tell us frankly—when are we going to have an abundance of it?

[Chuyko] Frankly, it will be a long time before it is abundant. However, as soon as 1992 we hope to fully eliminate the hunger for newsprint. How? First of all, a new paper-making machine will be commissioned at the Balakhna Pulp and Paper Combine. Secondly, by modernizing 11 of the largest paper-making machines in our country we will ensure a considerable increment of output.

[Rostarchuk] However, over this period of time new newspapers and magazines may appear. For example, it is expected that as soon as the coming year about 20 local trade union newspapers will begin publication. Are we going to write again that there is no newsprint for TRUD?

[Chuyko] Your apprehensions are justified. Of course, we cannot go on forever increasing the output of products on the existing equipment. Incidentally, the rated capacity of equipment has already been exceeded by now. The 5-year plan for paper production being 1,805,000 tons, we were given state orders which are 27,000 tons higher. Therefore, in order to solve this problem in a radical manner, we need to build new combines and develop the facilities of the pulp and paper industry. After all, it is just plain non-existent rather than underdeveloped! This, however, is a topic for another conversation.

EDITORIAL NOTE: When this material was prepared for publication, we were told that at the warehouse of the Kondopoga Pulp and Paper Combine alone about 3,000 tons of newsprint have accumulated, plus another 1,500 tons have been produced and are left in the shops. They cannot even remove the newsprint from the machines because the warehouses are clogged. There is newsprint but there is no newsprint. Who is to blame?

Finally, much to the regret of the editorial office, we inform you that today the residents of Khabarovsk will not receive our newspaper. The local printing plant has used too much newsprint because of its very old equipment, and there are no reserves at all.

On Tuesday, TRUD may not be be published in Kharkov and Donetsk...

Periodicals Threatened

90US0157B Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 89 p 3

[Article by D. Grafov: "At the Critical Line"]

(Text) Usually, journalists help readers who are in a difficult situation. Apparently, at present the roles have to change. What is the reason? Let us say for the laymen that newspapers and magazines are printed on paper. We hear a chorus of readers saying in unison: We know it, we know it.

You know it, but not all of it, and not all of you. For example, are you aware of the fact that the holiday issue of 7 October was printed on the last rolls of newsprint remaining at the publishing house? Had the newspaper needed to be published on Sunday, as it regularly does, this issue would not have seen the light of day. At any

rate, this is how Director of the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Publishing House V. Korolev described the situation.

He said: "On 6 October, they called us from the dispatcher service of the Northern River Port: 'Do not expect newsprint today. Motor Pool No 8 has sent all cars for unloading at the railroad.' We literally threw our hands up in the air. After all, leaving a publishing house without newsprint is the same as leaving a blast furnace without the ore or a canteen without foodstuffs.

"However, we had to find a way out. Several vehicles of our publishing house sped to the Southern Port. There is a warehouse over there with a reserve stock of newsprint. However, the only way to get to it was perhaps by helicopter. The way was blocked by an impassable assembly of passenger cars in front of the 'Cars' shop.

"In the afternoon, Motor Pool No 8 gave us one truck after all which, having made several hauls, brought in one-third of the newsprint needed. The rest was delivered on Monday and was used for printing right 'out of the truck.'"

This is why we are forced to remind the motor vehicle enterprises, and not them only: Newspapers cannot use paperless technology. By eliminating one emergency situation they have created another. At present, there is a stock of newsprint for only 10 days at the warehouses of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA which is one-half of the norm. Our main suppliers, the Balakhna and Kondopoga Pulp and Paper Combines, have put MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA on starvation rations referring to various reasons, primarily the lack of rolling stock.

The situation with printing other popular publications "assigned" to the same publishing house, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and SOVETSKIY SPORT, is even more acute. Thus, issue No 40 of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY was published on borrowed newsprint allocated for our newspaper. Other publications are teetering close to the brink.

The situation with imported newsprint used to print NOVOYE VREMYA and EKHO PLANETY is no better, However, foreign suppliers are not at fault.

Deputy Chief of the Supply Department of the publishing house V. Polyakov complains: "We were unable to unload three cars which arrived from Finland for 5 days. It rained every day. The cars were ours, domestic, so the Finnish 'paper' could turn to mush."

Could it be that rain is enough to ruin the reputation of a serious publishing house? Certainly not. It is just that new customs regulations took effect on 1 October. It is necessary to produce a customs declaration in order to pick up the freight. This document consists of 54 points of which 37 have to be filled in by the recipient. "As a matter of convenience," all information is index-coded, and nobody knows where the indexes are to be found. Customs officials are cool people, their answer is simple: Declarations have to be filled out by the contracting party. In this case, this means the All-Union Association Eksportles.

"The specialists of the foreign trade organization applied their experience and knowledge in practice filling out the declaration. Customs officials sent it right back: This is not right, it needs to be redone. They did it over, but once again it was not right. The bureaucratic merry-go-round was set in motion: Eksportles—customs—Eksportles...."

It could have spun until now. However, we succeeded in finding out that the Soyuzvneshtrans has mastered the art of filling out customs declarations—at a fee. Apparently, the Eksportles had to sign a contract with it. This is also how some cooperative in Sheremetyevo makes money: One declaration is 30 rubles.

You want to save money? Make use of the manual and instruction aids for "declaring the goods and assets moved across the state border of the USSR." They have been published by the Main Administration of State Customs Control. However, where are we to get them?

Chief of Freight Department No 2 of the Moscow Central Customs A. Kutepov said: "These documents are provided only to the declarer-middlemen—the Soyuzvneshtrans, Sovtransekspeditsiya, Sovtranstur, nine organizations in all. Unfortunately, I personally have only one copy. However, the cooperative Fakt, among other things, provides both the manual and the instruction aids to those who want them for an appropriate fee."

I will add that customs officials charge the contracting party 0.1 percent of the cost of the freight supplied for their "work" (This comes on top of the customs dues). Such are the new rules.

Let us not be petty. Money for a good cause is no object. However, all of it does not turn out that good.

Customs officials have to be present when each car and container is opened. The freight department which serves the railroad numbers only six people. In Moscow, there are 10 freight stations alone plus the spur lines of the the Northern and Southern Ports, warehouses, and enterprises. Now multiply all of that by hundreds of cars and containers....

Finally, they allowed us to unload the Finnish newsprint, and even gave us a 15-day deferment for the declaration. So, for now we are not saying good-bye to you, our dear readers! We expect your help. We count especially on the heads of the departments and services named. However, we are going to take care of ourselves, too, and we are going to establish the monitoring of the newsprint shortage by journalists: This way, the people's control might take part, as well as the control and audit commission. This, after all, is an endeavor of the party, of the entire people.

Full Employment Advocate Discusses Problems

PM2211114189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Professor A. Kotlyar article under the rubric "Forum for Discussion": "Is Full Employment Necessary"]

[Text] Moscow—An article under the title "People Without Jobs" was published in PRAVDA of 31 October 1989. The problems of employment which it addressed resulted in a flood of letters evincing keen and critical interest. The editorial office has decided to continue this debate. Today we publish an article by scientist A. Kotlyar devoted to the theoretical aspects of the problem of employment.

Lately there have been quite a few articles in the periodical press which call into question the expediency of maintaining full employment under socialism.

So what are the arguments of the opponents of full employment? They hold that full employment is a pernicious invention of the champions of administrative edict methods of management. Others, without bothering to argue their case, (just like the former, incidentally) claim that the connection between full employment and public ownership of the means of production is a "dubious theoretical precept."

It must be stated at the outset that it is not a question here of anyone's evil intentions or far-fetched theorization. Full employment of the able-bodied population is an objective consequence of a specific feature of the social organism, namely the firm establishment of forms of ownership which are incompatible with exploitation. **If society consists exclusively of working people and includes no exploiters, than the only source of the existence of every able-bodied citizen is his labor. The formula "he who does not work does not eat" means that everyone must have the opportunity to work. Consequently, full employment is one of the key forms of the implementation of public ownership. Without it neither the socialist idea of the universal nature of labor, nor both halves of the fundamental principle of socialism "from each according to his capabilities, to each according to his labor" are realizable. Therefore efforts to find reserves for increasing economic efficiency by renouncing full employment have nothing in common with socialism.**

Full employment does not mean universal employment, of course. Full employment presupposes an adequate number of jobs for the economically active population, that is that section of the able-bodied citizens who want to work in the national economy as workers, employees, cooperative members, or people engaging in "individual" labor activity. The other section of able-bodied citizens (women who are not working in connection with childbirth or child raising, students, and so forth) do not require jobs and are not classed as part of the economically active population.

What arguments are used against full employment, despite its self-evident socialist nature? Attempts to blame empty shelves in the stores, low productivity, and insufficient labor remuneration on full employment cannot expect to be taken seriously. If we were to follow this line, it would be possible equally successfully to ascribe to full employment the national economy's structural absurdities, the inflated nature and inefficiency of the management apparatus, the nonfulfillment of functions by the production sphere as a result of which it operates for its own purposes rather than for the benefit of the consumer, producing useless substandard goods, and so forth. These and many other problems are not the result of full employment (there is no cause-and-effect relationship here) but rather the result of the distortion of socialist ownership relations and disregard for economic methods of management. People are idle at work not because of full employment, but because of poor organization of social labor and the absence of effective incentives.

Despite all the shortcomings of our economy, it has never happened yet that the production sphere was artificially overmanned for the sake of full employment. On the contrary, many sectors and regions experience a shortage of labor to this day. For instance, according to figures of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State Committee for Labor and Social Problems there were more than 1 million vacancies in the RSFSR national economy at the beginning of 1989. Staffing difficulties are the main cause of idle equipment and a low shift index in many places. This does not mean, of course, that there are no internal manpower reserves at enterprises. Full employment does not explain the desire to have a manpower reserve which stems from last-minute rush work to fulfill the plan, or the need to release people for work in the fields, at vegetable depots, on construction sites, in cleaning up city districts, and so forth.

Full employment is not only a key economic guarantee of the social position of each working person, it is also the basis for the highly productive utilization of socialist society's labor potential. The opponents of full employment refuse to grasp that the labor of any normally working member of society is always the source of additional benefits, while unemployment is always an unproductive deduction from society's assets. Specialists are aware of the efforts that are made in capitalist society in order to reduce unemployment. However this is hampered by objective obstacles which cannot be fully overcome by the processes of social evolution which are under way at the moment.

In socialist society the possibility of providing an adequate number of jobs for the entire economically active population is based on socialist production relations: What is meant is the fundamental priority given to the human factor rather than material conditions in the production sphere. In this context, from the very beginning the creation of jobs in both quantitative and qualitative terms must be determined by the dynamics of demographic processes and the cultural and technical standards of the working people. Ultimately it must

correspond to the need of the economically active population for labor. The deformation of the principles of socialism was due primarily to the violation of the primacy of the human factor in production.

The achievement of relations of full employment is assisted by the constantly growing capacity of the internal market and also the utilization of different methods in providing scope for the application of labor depending on the various stages of development. The period of predominantly extensive development was accompanied by an expansion of employment in material production; the transition to predominantly intensive methods of development marked the beginning of the development of the nonproduction sphere. In the future, in step with the qualitative improvement of production, cuts in working time are to be expected. Making use of these factors, society is able to guarantee full employment at all the qualitative levels of development of social production.

In attacking full employment, its opponents, logically speaking, either directly advocate unemployment (on a small scale, it goes without saying), or condone it as an inevitable side-effect of an efficient economy. So for instance, one highly respected author is advocating 2-percent unemployment in the assumption that if "the unemployed... receive unemployment benefit instead of a guaranteed wage, labor discipline is bound to rise immediately." Alas, this assumption is wrong from the outset. The years of the command economy have given birth to a mass of people who are simply no longer used to working conscientiously. In these conditions the prospect of "legally" receiving something for doing nothing will seem attractive to many and produce a diametrically opposite result.

This question has another, more serious side. The point is that the absence of unemployment is one of the economic advantages of socialism (its Soviet model) which the working people can actually appreciate. It is true that the real income of our "exploitation-free worker" is several times smaller than that of his Western colleague "who is carrying the yoke of capitalist slavery." It is also true that the planned economy is staggering under disproportions, lack of balance, and shortages while in conditions of the market despite its vagaries (moderated by regulation on the part of the state, it is true) the coordination of the structural components of the national economy is carried out much more effectively, and so forth.

The question arises whether, in these circumstances, we have the right to cede without further ado virtually the only commanding position held by socialism which has not just economic, but also political and moral merits. Whether we might not be voluntarily ceding one of socialism's few remaining strongholds with whose help we are hoping to redeploy our forces in the course of perestroyka and to restore to socialism its true face which had been disfigured?

Allow me to draw your attention to the fact that none of the authors who are linking unemployment with increased efficiency has tried to explain how this mechanism works, i.e. to show how unemployment could contribute to increasing the efficiency of the socialist economy (apart from naively pinning their hopes on its impact as a discipline booster). In their search for a suitable model, individual authors refer to the experience of capitalist countries, asking: "Is it fortuitous that in all the capitalist countries which have considerably outstripped us, there has always been a certain unused manpower reserve?" It goes without saying that it is not fortuitous since a mechanism for extracting relative additional value is in operation there. As a result, unemployment under capitalism is accompanied by a constant desire for greater efficiency; however, it is a specific kind of efficiency, efficiency which produces profit for the capitalist. After all, people become unemployed not because society does not need their labor but because the labor of these people cannot be used to produce profit.

The scientific and technical revolution, given the limitations of the market, does not make it possible to involve all who so wish in production. Unemployment, by exerting pressure on the workers, creates a situation on the labor market which favors capitalists and the growth of a capitalist-efficiency type of profit.

An analysis of the ties prevailing in the sphere of labor relations in socialist production does not reveal (at least not so far!) any social strata which could somehow utilize unemployment in their interests. Therefore claims that unemployment could produce some sort of return for socialist society are unfounded. The positive role of unemployment has not been corroborated either by the Chinese or Yugoslav models of socialism, within the framework of which the relative overpopulation is viewed as a substantial shortcoming, a deviation from the socialist ideal whose elimination is regarded as one of the key tasks.

Although unemployment in capitalist countries accords with the class interests of certain strata, society as a whole reacts to this phenomenon extremely negatively. The experience of these countries has shown that **the consequences of unemployment span a whole range of antisocial phenomena—the loss by a section of the working people of their professional knowledge and know-how and also of their appetite for work, a rising crime rate, drug addiction, prostitution, and increased incidence of serious diseases, primarily mental illness and cardiovascular disease.** Governments in capitalist countries spend up to 5.5 percent of GNP on programs to reduce unemployment. Those who want to learn from other people's experience must admit that unemployment is not just harmful in social respects, it also costs society dearly.

The key avenue of the employment policy in our country at the present stage must be the prevention of a manpower surplus. At the same time it is necessary to take

account of the complexity of the phenomenon of a manpower surplus as such. The traditional areas of manpower surplus (Central Asia, the southern regions of Kazakhstan, parts of the Transcaucasus, and the national autonomies in the North Caucasus) have taken shape as a result of the low mobility of the indigenous (predominantly rural) population. The poor development of nonagricultural production capcities in rural areas of these regions has also left its mark.

However, the traditional manpower surplus regions are not the only "critical" point in the sphere of employment. The mass layoffs in the sphere of material production in the near future (15-16 million people are to be released) are fraught with a fundamentally different manpower surplus situation of a much more acute nature unless appropriate steps are taken.

First, a manpower surplus resulting from layoffs inevitably exceeds the regional framework and assumes a nationwide, national economic character. If this happens, an overall shortage of jobs for the country's entire economically active population arises.

Second, a manpower surplus resulting from mass layoffs will be marked by considerably higher internal tension since it will encompass regions with a highly mobile population in conditions of an overall shortage of jobs. Precisely this second type of manpower surplus is threatening most rayons of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and other republics where previously there has been a manpower deficit.

It follows from what has been said here that despite all the attention necessary to resolve regional employment problems (primarily in the traditional manpower surplus areas) the main focus must be on the program of timely preparations for mass layoffs in the sphere of material production.

To what extent is it possible to rely on the "labor market" as a panacea in the sphere of employment, as certain authors are doing. Without engaging in theoretical analysis, it is necessary nonetheless to note that ownership relations will neither now nor in the future serve as the basis for the stratification of society into owners of means of production and those deprived of means of production (since the development of these relations will continue to follow the socialist path). Therefore manpower in our country is not a commodity and the hire of labor is not a reflection of a purchase-and-sale relationship. This predetermines the nonmarket nature of the movement of manpower. Nonetheless, there is some potential for the utilization of market elements here. Above all, this applies to the economic stimulation of the migration of labor resources with a view to the priority targeting of these resources on the most progressive and efficient production facilities. In other words, optimum conditions to attract cadres must be created in those sectors and regions on which the development of the country and the people's prosperity depend. As yet the success of cooperatives in competition with the state sector for skilled cadres is no means always in line with this principle. Naturally, the creation of real conditions to encourage the free migration of labor resources will necessitate, among other things, changes in the passport system with its registration restrictions, and the solution of the housing problem.

However, under any conditions the potential of the market mechanism should not be overrated. Present-day capitalism would not be as strong as it is if it had relied exclusively on the market. Organizational methods of influencing the economy, and especially index planning, which have helped the West to overcome the vicissitudes of the market and achieve controlled development, are based on serious scientific analysis. Furthermore, in spheres such as scientific and technical progress and employment, planning and purposeful regulation are a decisive, not an auxiliary lever.

The opponents of full employment should bear all this in mind and instead of seeking a panacea should soundly assess the potential of both others' and their own experience. So the existing job placement system in our country, despite all its shortcomings, has on the whole proved its great effectiveness in the organization of the distribution of labor resources. If it were improved (primarily with the help of economic levers!), it would be possible to achieve effective employment. **In socialist conditions only employment which is at the same time both rational and full can be regarded as effective.**

Nonferrous Metallurgy Short of Consumer Targets

PM2111134589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[A. Davydov report: "Shortages and Personal Responsibility"]

[Text] The First Congress of USSR People's Deputies noted with alarm that the country is experiencing acute shortages of goods, especially domestic appliances. The situation has not improved since the congress. People's deputies, jointly with people's controllers, decided to investigate the causes. Even a preliminary study of the state of affairs revealed that one of the most acute difficulties blocking progress is the chronic shortage of nonferrous metals. Therefore the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Everyday, and Other Services to the Population, jointly with the USSR People's Control Committee Heavy Industry Department, inspected the work of nonferrous metallurgy enterprises in a series of krays and oblasts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Kazakh SSR, and the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic to determine the collectives' diligence in seeking and utilizing reserves to boost output volumes and to expand consumer goods production. The inspection materials were examined at a joint sitting of the parliamentary commission and the USSR People's Control Committee.

Ye.A. Varnachev, first deputy chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, delivered a report on shortcomings in the implementation of measures to increase the manufacture and expand the range of consumer goods by nonferrous metallurgy enterprises. He sharply criticized the state of affairs in the sector: The task of bringing manufacture of goods by nonferrous metallurgy enterprises to the proportion of at least R1 per R1 of labor remuneration funds by 1995, as set by the government, is in jeopardy. This indicator, the speaker noted, does not exceed 15 kopeks for the sector as a whole at present, and stands at 2-3 kopeks in a number of enterprises. The sector is mainly to blame for the fact that now there is an acute shortage of a prime necessity like, for example, kettles—be they electric or perfectly ordinary aluminum ones. Many enterprises altogether lack specialized production units for goods manufacture. Manual labor predominates in those that do exist, labor remuneration systems are far from perfect, and consequently there is a great turnover and shortage of cadres, especially skilled workers. The pernicious practice of the fulfillment of state orders in money terms by less labor-intensive production units at the expense of the manufacture of more complex goods which are in short supply prevails virtually everywhere. Listing the enterprises where the situation is at its worst, Ye. A. Varnachev named Leningrad's "Krasnyy Vyborzhets" Production Association, the Irtysh Polymetallic Combine and Ust-Kamenogorsk Titanium-Magnesium Combine in East Kazakhstan Oblast, and the Bratsk Aluminum Plant in Irkutsk Oblast.

There followed a detailed exchange of opinions on the causes of this situation.

In his speech USSR Minister of Metallurgy S.V. Kolpakov fully accepted the criticism of the sector. S.V. Kolpakov briefed the sitting's participants in detail about the program of measures planned and being implemented by the ministry.

The sharply critical tone of the conversation did not abate following the minister's speech. Deputies V.A. Levakin and V.V. Korobkin, V.S. Gudin, member of the USSR Ministry of Trade Collegium, and V.A. Vanchikov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan], shared their views on the causes of the prevailing situation and proposals on how to remedy the situation. The sitting also heard leadership workers from a number of nonferrous metallurgy enterprises.

G.V. Kolbin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, and G.N. Kiselev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade, and Municipal, Everyday, and Other Services to the Population, who spoke in conclusion, summed up the results of the discussion and especially emphasized that both deputies and people's controllers intend to monitor in the future the range of questions which were examined.

The joint resolution adopted on the sitting's results lays down specific measures to improve the situation. Specifically, the USSR Gosplan and the USSR Ministry of Metallurgy were instructed to continue their work on ensuring that nonferrous metallurgy enterprises' commodity production plans and material and technical supplies are fully balanced in 1990. It was deemed expedient to create, in the conditions of regional economic accountability which is now developing and on the basis of intersector production sharing, specialized production units for the manufacture of complex domestic appliances and articles with consumer qualities up to world standards.

Having examined the inspection materials, the USSR People's Control Committee adopted a separate resolution on the responsibility of officials in nonferrous metallurgy enterprises for unfulfilled production and contract commitment targets for consumer goods deliveries.

Scientific

TASS Reports 'Mir' Module Launch 26 Nov

Details Given

LD2411140389 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—By TASS correspondent reporting from the Mission Control Centre:

Soviet cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov, on board the orbiting Mir space station, in the past few days carried out a number of geophysical and technical experiments and replaced used air-conditioning blocks.

Under the medical control plan, the cosmonauts underwent an all-around examination of their cardio-vascular systems, using electrocardiographs.

Today, under a programme for geophysical studies, the crew will conduct experiments to study the ionosphere and the magnetosphere of the earth.

Viktorenko and Serebrov will also continue to load used equipment into an unmanned cargo spacecraft, Progress-M.

At Baikonur Cosmodrome, preparations are under way for the launch of a proton carrier rocket which will deliver a special equipment module to the Mir station.

The launch has been scheduled for 16:01 Moscow time [1301 GMT] on November 26.

Final Preparations

LD2511165489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0524 GMT 25 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow 25 Nov (TASS)—The launch of the module, which will deliver further equipment to the

Soviet long-duration 'Mir' orbiting station is preliminarily set for 1600 Mosow time [1300 GMT] on 26 November, the TASS correspondent was told in the USSR Glavkosmos [Main Administration for the Development and Use of Space Technology for the National Economy and Scientific Research].

So, only 24 hours remain before the module is put into space by the "Proton" carrier rocket. Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov, who are working for their 3d month on the 'Mir' orbiting complex, have been impatiently waiting this. Indeed, there is equipment in the module for further supplying the complex, which will allow the program of scientific research to be significantly extended. it is equipped with a lock chamber to allow the cosmonauts to go out into open space and have everything necessary for working there. So, a 'space bicycle,' a unit allowing the cosmonaut to move about autonomously, know as the 'Ikar' will be delivered into space. In the module are also supplies of water, fuel, and food.

The docking with the 'Mir' Complex, which has been in space since February 1986, is planned for December.

It has twice been necessary to change the time of the launch of the equipment modul; the first time was in April because of delays in preparing the modul. The decision was made to use the station without a crew, in order to economize resources and better prepare for the new stage of work of 'Mir.'

It was necessary to move the date of the launch, planned for the middle of September because a certain unreliability of individual elements was discovered in the course of the land tests in the 'Kurs' system, which ensures that the module goes into the given orbit and approaches the station. Careful checks and tests were required before the specialists certified that the renewed system of automatic docking was ready for use.

Today the last preparation for launch are proceeding.

Launch Announced

LD2611141189 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—By TASS correspondent:

A re-equipment module of the Soviet Mir orbital space station was fired off from the Baykonur Cosmodrome at 16:01, Moscow Time, today. It is being put into orbit by Proton booster rocket.

It is planned that the module will dock with the Mir complex which has been in space since February 1986, on December 2, 1989.

Further Details

LD2611172189 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 26 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

A re-equipment module of the Soviet Mir orbital space station was fired off from the Baykonur Cosmodrome at 16:01, Moscow time, today. It is being put into orbit by Proton booster rocket.

It is planned that the module will dock with the Mir complex which has been in space since February 1986, on December 2, 1989.

Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov working at the Mir orbital station for the third month, are impatiently waiting for the module, since it carries instrumentation for re-equipment of the station, which will enable them to expand considerably the research programme.

It has an air lock chamber for cosmonauts' space walk-outs and other equipment to work there. The module will bring a "space bike" called Ikar, a vehicle for cosmonauts' independent movements in space. The module also has water, fuel and foodstuffs.

The module's launching was put off two times. The first time it was in April due to a delay in manufacturing the module. It was decided to operate the station without a crew to save funds and to prepare better for a new stage in the station's work.

The second launching scheduled for mid-September was put off due to the fact that some unreliability in the operation of several components was detected in the Kurs system putting the module into a pre-set orbit and its rendezvous with the station during ground tests.

The system was painstakingly tested at the factory, before specialists became convinced that the improved system of automatic docking was ready for operation.

'Kvant-2' Battery Panel Fails To Open

LD2611211689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1915 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Kaliningrad (Moscow Oblast), 26 Nov (TASS)—TASS correspondent reports from the Flight Control Centre. [Passage omitted]

The launching and liftoff of the heavy module took place without a hitch. However, after the 'Kvant-2' separated from the carrier, it was established from telemetric information that one of the solar panels had not fully opened. After a brief prompt meeting a decision was made to repeat the command to open the solar panel during the next communication session. We waited for the beginning of the communication session. The digital board of the Flight Control Centre lit up: Entering the zone was to start at 1755. The module finally entered the

zone. The experts worked with precision in the 'Kvant-2' control room. The command to open the solar panel was issued at the moment of 'Kvant-2' passing over the northern part of the Caspian Sea. But the equipment at the Flight Control Center failed to transmit the information. The telemetric data confirmed once more that the solar panel in the fourth plane did not fully open.

Of course, the failure of the solar panel to open fully is not fatal for 'Kvant-2.' In principle after the docking of the module with the complex, the cosmonauts can start working on it during one of their space walks, although the final decision is up to those who are in charge of the flight. But for the moment, the experts are trying to fully open the panel with the aid of the resources aboard at the order from earth. [passage omitted]

'Kvant-2' Profile, Orbital Parameters

LD2611191189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1803 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Nov (TASS)—The specialized 'Kvant-2' module, with a mass of about 20 tonnes, was launched in the Soviet Union into near-earth orbit today by a 'Proton' carrier-rocket in accordance with the space research program.

The module is intended for upgrading the 'Mir' orbital station with additional equipment and apparatus to substantially expand research and experiments carried out in the interest of science and the national economy.

The on-board systems of the module: Orientation and movement control with the use of power gyroscopic stabilizers, electricity supply, and life support systems with improved equipment for the regeneration of water and to obtain oxygen, will be switched into the general circuit of the orbital complex. This will increase the efficiency of its use and reduce the traffic of expendable materials being delivered from earth.

The scientific apparatus of the module was developed by specialists from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and the GDR.

The orbit parameters of the specialized module are:

— maximum distance from the earth's surface: 339 km;
— minimum distance from the earth's surface: 221 km;
— a period of revolution: 89.3 minutes;
— inclination: 51.6 degrees;

The docking of the 'Kvant-2' module and the manned 'Mir' complex is planned for 2 December.

'Kvant-2' Module Measurements

LD2611191989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1258 GMT 26 Nov 89

[Summary] The 'Kvant-2' module weighs 19,565 kg, its maximum length is 13.73 meters, and its maximum diameter is 4.35 meters. The maximum volume of all its compartments is 59 cubic meters. The module will orbit for six days before docking with 'Mir.' It will then be transfered to another docking bay.

'Cosmos 2050' Satellite Launched 23 Nov

LD2411154189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1527 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 24 Nov (TASS)—'Cosmos 2050,' a routine earth satellite intended to continue the exploration of outer space was launched in the USSR on Thursday by a Molniya carrier rocket. It was put into orbit with the following parameters: Initial period of rotation 11 hours 49 minutes; maximum distance from the surface of the earth 39,342km; minimum 603km; inclination of orbit 62.8 degrees.

The apparatus is working normally.

Military

Tu-22M Aircraft Crashes in Tatarskiy Strait

PM2411200389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Yuriy Balakirev report: "Crash in Straits"]

[Text] Vladivostok—A Tu-22M aircraft of the Pacific Fleet Aviation went out of control while returning from a training mission and ditched in the Tatarskiy Strait. The two crew members managed to eject. They were located, but only one of the pilots was successfully picked up by helicopter. The doctors fought unsuccessfully to save him. The cause of the crash is being investigated by a special commission.

Lizichev Talks With Delegates to Student Forum

PM2311101589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Major L. Gusakov report: "Interested, Constructive Dialogue"]

[Text] The 18 November meeting between Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, V.A. Vostrov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense Military Education Main Directorate, and other generals and officers and cadets and students who are delegates to the All-Union Student Forum took the form of a frank, amicable, and constructive conversation.

The meeting's participants talked about military schools' acute problems, of which, it should be said, a great many have accumulated. In the delegates' opinion, by no means all the country's higher military educational establishments have created conditions which are conducive to fully revealing people's abilities and make it possible to train for the Army and Navy specialists who match up to the ever-increasing demands of the time.

It is notable that during the meeting the Main Political Directorate's guests talked frankly about painful subjects and made constructive proposals directed at improving matters. The idea of tightening up the criteria for vocational selection when making up school rolls and then annually testing cadets to prevent poorly trained nonentities from becoming officers was voiced very insistently.

A proposal by V. Zhaglovskiy, cadet at the USSR Ministry of Defense Military Institute, who sees in cadets' activity a source of additional means for improving the institute's training material base, was also supported by the leadership. To be more precise, he sees this in their willingness to do good-quality translations from foreign languages for interested civilian organizations and in setting up a legal consultation service for the population. The proposal to allow the most gifted cadets to collect material for a candidate's dissertation in the process of scientific work was also noted. Attention was focused on the question of giving military higher educational institutions which train specialists for foreign states opportunities to use some of their foreign currency earnings for their own purposes. It is well known that this problem is being solved in civilian higher educational institutions.

Army General A.D. Lizichev addressed the forum's delegates. He advised the cadets and students not to lose the innovative enthusiasm and focus on creative work which they have gained during the debate. He agreed that it would be expedient to discuss military schools' problems more thoroughly at an all-army cadet forum.

The delegates were presented with valuable gifts.

Political Chief Interviewed on Strategic Forces'

PM2311105589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[N. Belan interview with Colonel General V.S. Rodin, member of the Strategic Rocket Forces Military Council and chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces Political Directorate: "Masters of Strategic Missiles"—date and place of interview not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Belan] Viktor Semenovich, yesterday we talked in detail with some officers. But the point I would like to emphasize is this. What effect, in your opinion, are processes such as the lessening of military confrontation in the world and the destruction of an entire class of missiles having on the content of alert duty?

[Rodin] Alert duty is the chief content of missilemen's service and the main form of maintaining constant combat readiness in the Rocket Forces. To be honest, it is a complex matter. It requires the highest degree of discipline and professionalism, maximum self-discipline, readiness for immediate resolute action literally at a second's notice, and the ability to rapidly find your bearings in the most complicated situations, make the only correct decision, and work efficiently as a member of the duty combat crew. It is a truly sacred concept for every missileman.

You quite rightly speak of the new elements in the international situation. The political climate is appreciably warmer. Even 5 years ago would it have been possible for USSR Defense Minister Army General D.T. Yazov and Strategic Rocket Forces Commander in Chief Army General Yu.P. Maksimov to visit the United States, meet with the military leadership there, and visit military facilities?

What about the elimination of an entire class of weapons—intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and their warheads? Is this not evidence that the new political thinking put forward by our party is becoming increasingly well established in world affairs?

But there is also another reality. It is that the threat of war **has not been eliminated along with the Soviet and American intermediate-range missiles**—these only make up four percent of the sides' nuclear missile potential. Moreover, even if a Soviet-American agreement is signed on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive forces, despite the enormous political significance of this step, it will not fully resolve the problem of nuclear missile confrontation. Therefore there are no radical changes in the content of missilemen's alert duty, and the concept of combat readiness is also unchanged.

But the conditions of alert duty are changing, since the situation in which the Rocket Forces are resolving the tasks that face them are also changing.

[Belan] For example?

[Rodin] For example, the military doctrine unequivocally specifies that the USSR will not be the first to use nuclear missiles. We reserve the right to retaliatory action alone. In such conditions we must increase the combat readiness of the Rocket Forces as much as possible and ensure that alert duty is constantly performed according to the top category for assessing its parameters.

Therefore I can say that strain in missilemen's combat service is increasing. This is an objective reality. There are simply no other conditions yet for ensuring equal security for both sides during equivalent reductions in armed forces.

[Belan] In connection with these changes, how do you now see the role and place of the Strategic Rocket Forces? What are the prospects for their development?

[Rodin] The Strategic Rocket Forces are the main component of our country's strategic nuclear forces, and it is impossible to diminish their role and significance in ensuring security.

As regards prospects for developing the Rocket Forces, it must be noted first of all that the Rocket Forces grouping will undergo substantial changes before summer 1991 as

a result of the completion of the elimination of intermediate-range missiles. It will only be left with intercontinental ballistic missiles. The main directions in their improvement are traditional: accuracy, survivability, reliability, and an absolute guarantee against unsanctioned actions.

In addition, if we are speaking about prospects for the development of the Strategic Rocket Forces, we must bear in mind the fact that, given the transition in resolving defensive tasks to the principles of reasonable sufficiency and to a reduction in the level of military spending, the main emphasis in resolving tasks of combat readiness will be placed primarily on qualitative parameters. This problem is complex and embraces literally all aspects of the forces' life and activity—the assimilation of combat equipment, combat training and education of the personnel, the improvement of material and everyday provision for the missilemen and their families, and the solution of acute social problems. All this is not easy to solve, but it is precisely this that is one of the most important directions in the perestroyka that is developing actively in the Rocket Forces. [Passage omitted]